Taqiyyah (Expedient dissimulation)

Work file: taqiyyah.pdf
Project: Answering-Ansar.org Articles

Revisions:

No.	Date	Author	Description	Review Info
2.0.0	05.10.2008	Answering-Ansar.org	Created	

Contents

Table of Contents

1. Chapter One: Definition of Taqqiyah

Islamzine.com states:

One other Imami Shi'a doctrine that must be related is the doctrine of Taqiyyah, or dissimulation, (i.e. calculated deception). In support of this doctrine of deception, the Shi'a attribute the following to Abu Abdullah (Ja'far as-Sadiq): "Nine tenths of religion is Taqiyyah (dissimulation), hence one who does not dissimulate has no religion." (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.110) "He who conceals his religion has saved it, and he who makes it public has destroyed it." "A believer who does not dissimulate is like a body without a head." (Tafseer al-Askari) "Mix with them (i.e. non-Shi'a) externally but oppose them internally." (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.116)

1. The 'actual' definition of Taqiyyah

Taqiyyah means **'concealing one's religion or faith due to fear, but in one's heart, the person must believe in the religion s/he is concealing'.** In other words it is a form of self-defence that encompasses defending one's life, property, esteem and beliefs. According to the Shariah, if a person is trapped between two hardships and one of them is intolerable, then to save oneself from the greater hardship, one should tolerate the lesser one. Therefore, Imam of Ahle Sunnah Allamah Fakhruddin Razi wrote:

When faced with two hardships, one should go through the smaller one to save one's self from the bigger one. This is a recognized fact.
Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 5, Page 746-750 (published in Istanbul)

In the same Tafseer, we read:

"Taqiyyah is permissible till the day of Qayamah and this statement is better because it is Wajib to protect our life from any harm"
Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 4 page 170

If speaking the truth can cause a man to lose his life, property or esteem, then it is a natural instinct that he shall seek to protect those things, through methods that can include (in some circumstances) refraining from stating the truth. Islam claims to be the religion of nature, one that in times of desperate need allows its adherent to even eat the meat of dead animal or pork.

He hath only forbidden you dead meat and blood and the flesh of swine and that on which any other name hath been invoked besides that of Allah but if one is forced by necessity without wilful disobedience nor transgressing due limits then is he guiltless. For Allah is Oft-Forgiving Most Merciful.
Surah Al Baqara, Ayah 173; transliteration of Abdullah Yusuf Ali

Famed Ahle-Hadeeth scholar Maulana Waheed uz Zaman Khan records:

"Al-Taqqiyah also means that a man conceals his belief due to a fear of losing his honor or life. This is permissible according to all, the Ahle Sunnah and Imamiyah. It is stated in the Quran that 'A believer, a man from among the people of Pharaoh,

who had concealed his faith' [40:28]' and 'except by way of precaution, that ye may Guard yourselves from them.' [3:28].
Ammar Yasir had practiced Taqqiyah, as did Muhammad bin Musalimah"
Lughaat al-Hadeeth, Alphabet 'Tay' page 17

At another place, while mentioning the statement of Hasan Basri, Maulana Waheed uz Zaman stated:

'**At-Taqiyya shall remain until the Day of Resurrection. It means, that if one fears losing his life, or being dishonored, or the amputation of an organ or of some severe jolt that is unbearable, then to save oneself through some dissimulation is called Taqiyyah.'**
Lughaat al-Hadeeth, Alphabet 'Tay' page 85

Ibn Hajar Asaqlani gives the following definition of Taqqiyah:

قلت ومعنى التقية الحذر من إظهار ما في النفس من معتقد وغيره للغير

"**I say that the meaning of Taqiyyah is to be cautious of revealing that which is in one's mind regarding ones beliefs and practices, in front of others."**
Fath al-Bari, Volume 12 page 314

Imam Ibn Hayan Andlasi records in Tafseer Bahar al-Muheet, Volume 3 page 190:

.قال ابن مسعود : خالطوا الناس وزايلوهم وعاملوهم بما يشتهون ، ودينكم فلا تثلموه

Ibn Masud said: "Live, comply and behave with the people as they like but as for your religion, don't harm it".

2. Chapter Two: Taqiyyah proven from Quran

It is an irrefutable fact that the use of Taqiyyah can be proved from both the Qur'an and the sayings of the Prophet Mohammed (S). All the prophets (A.S), the Imams (A.S) and others pious people offered advice on practising Taqiyyah. The following Quranic verses support our case:

2. First verse

"Anyone who after accepting faith in Allah utters unbelief except under compulsion his heart remaining firm in faith but such as open their breast to unbelief on them is Wrath from Allah and theirs will be a dreadful Penalty"
Surah An-Nahal, verse 106 transliteration by Abdullah Yusuf Ali

All Muslim scholars agree that this verse descended in relation to the suffering of Ammar bin Yasir (ra). Allamah Jalaludeen Suyuti in his commentary of this verse states:

The non-believers once caught Ammar-bin-Yaser (ra) and they forced him to praise their false gods and to condemn Prophet Muhammad (s). They forced him to an extent that Ammar bin Yasir (ra) gave in, and conceded to their demands. After that, when he returned to the Prophet Muhammed (s), Ammar (ra) narrated the whole story to him (s). Prophet Muhammad (S) asked him: "How do you feel in your heart?" To which Ammar (A.S) replied: "I am fully content with Allah's religion in my heart". To this Prophet Mohammed (S) said: "If non-believers ask you to say the same again, say it". Then the following ayah was revealed:

'Anyone who, after accepting faith in Allah, utters disbelief (save under compulsion and even then his heart remains firm in faith) on them is Wrath from Allah and theirs will be a dreadful Penalty'
Tafseer Dur al Manthur Volume 4 page 132, Cairo edition

We also read:

وأما عمار فقال لهم كلمة أعجبتهم تقية

"**Ammar said to them under Taqiyyah a word which they liked"**

When this incident occurred with Ammar bin Yasir, people said to the Holy Prophet (s), "O messenger of Allah (s), Ammar has become a non-believer". Prophet Muhammad (s) replied, "It is not possible. Ammar is full of Islamic zeal from head to toe. This zeal is mixed in his flesh and blood". A while later, Ammar (ra) came to the Prophet (s) crying. After wiping Ammar's (ra) tears, Prophet Mohammed (S) said, "What happened? If non-believers force you to repeat these words, repeat them".

*The incident has been declared authentic by various Imams of Ahle Sunnah. Ibn Hajar Asqalani said: '**The chain is Sahih'** (al-Deraya fi Takhrij ahadith al-Hidaya, volume 2 page 197). Imam al-Hakim said: '**Sahih according to the conditions of two Sheikhs (Bukhari & Muslim)'** (al-Mustadrak, volume 2 page 357) while Imam al-Dhahabi echoed the same (Talkhees al-Mustadrak). Ibn Kathir said: '**The chain is Sahih'** (Irshad al-Faqih, volume 2 page 295).*

After recording the above incident, Qadhi Baydhawi commented:

وهو دليل على جواز التكلم بالكفر عند الاكراه

"This verse is a proof that if one is forced to, one can denounce Islam".
Tafseer Baydhawi, Volume 1, Page 453, Publishers, Luknow

In relation to this verse, Imam of Ahle Sunnah Allamah Abu Hussein Firah Al Baghwi commented:

واجمع العلماء على أن من أكره على كلمة الكفر يجوز له أن يقول بلسانه

All scholars of the Muslim Ummah agree on the fact that at times when one is forced, one can denounce Islam.
Tafseer Mu'alim al Tnazeel, Volume 2, Page 214, Published Bombay

Allamah Fakhraddin Razi in Tafseer Kabir, Volume 5, Page 564, Published Istanbul, wrote:

It is an agreed fact that while denouncing the Islamic faith, one's heart must not be content with it

Allamah Khazin in Libab-ul-Taweel, Volume 3, Page 136 (published in Egypt) while writing a commentary about this ayah, after giving the traditions regarding Ammar (A.S), wrote:

إن الآية عامة في كل من أكره على الكفر، وقلبه مطمئن بالإيمان، وإن كان السبب خاصاً

This verse is directed to anyone who has been forced to denounce Islam, but is content with Islam in his heart, even if the reason behind this is out of the ordinary.

3. Second verse

Let not the believers take for friends or helpers Unbelievers rather than believers: if any do that, in nothing will there be help from Allah: except by way of precaution, that ye may Guard yourselves from them. But Allah cautions you (To remember) Himself; for the final goal is to Allah.
Surah Al-Imran, verse 28 transliteration of Abdullah Yusuf Ali

Imam Bukhari records in his Sahih:

وقال {إلا أن تتقوا منهم تقاة } وهى تقية

"'Except by way of precaution, that ye may Guard yourselves from them (3:28)' <u>and this is Taqqiyah</u>"

In fact in Tafsir Dur al-Manthur, Volume 2 page 176 we read that the early Sunni scholars used to read the word 'Taqata' as 'Taqiyyah' in this verse:

وأخرج عبد عن أبي رجاء أنه كان يقرأ إلا أن تتقوا منهم تقية

Abed bin Hamid narrated that Abi Raja used to recite "ELA AN TATAQU MENHUM TAQYYIAH"

We also read:

وأخرج عبد بن حميد عن قتادة أنه كان يقرؤها إلا أن تتقوا منه تقية

Narrated Abed bin Hamid that Qutada used to recite "ELA AN TATAQU MENHU TAQYYIAH"

Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani in his commentary of the above cited text of Sahih Bukhari records:

تقاة وتقية واحد... ومعنى الآية : لا يتخذ المؤمن الكافر وليا في الباطن ولا في الظاهر إلا للتقية في الظاهر فيجوز أن يواليه إذا خافه ويعاديه باطنا

"Taqata and Taqqiyah are the same thing...the meaning of this verse is that no

believer shall befriend an unbeliever either internally or externally except in Taqqiyah externally. It is permitted to befriend him if he is afraid of them but he must keep enmity from them internally"
Fatah ul Bari, Volume 12 page 313

Qadhi Baydhawi states in Tafseer Baydhawi, volume 1, page 134 (Luknow), in his commentary of the verse states:

But if you want to remain safe from the disbelievers, means, if you have some fear from them regarding a thing from which you want to remain safe from them then you can surely take them as friends... Allah [swt] has stopped the believers from befriending the disbelievers either internally or expressly, but if there is any fear from them then one can exhibit friendliness.

Allamah Fakhruddin Razi had commented on this verse:

Undoubtedly, there is no harm in practicing Taqiyyah if a believer is caught up between non-believers and his life or property comes under threat from them. In such circumstances he should conceal his enmity from them. Infact, he should talk in such a manner that his words should show passion. His heart should not confirm what he is saying. Taqiyyah does not have an effect on one's heart; it only has an external effect.
Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 2, Page 626, Published Istanbul

So we have the word of Allah, and the confirmation of the Sunni Ulema that these verses endorse the use of Taqiyyah to protect ones life. And yet the Nawasib are seeking to define Taqiyyah as calculated deception that contradicts the Qur'an. Whose word shall we rely those of this Nasibi group or the verdict of Allah (swt)?

4. Third Verse

In Holy Quran we read a about a believer who performed Taqiyyah during the reign of Firown:

[Yusufali 40:28] A believer, a man from among the people of Pharaoh, who had concealed his faith, said: "Will ye slay a man because he says, 'My Lord is Allah'?- when he has indeed come to you with Clear (Signs) from your Lord? and if he be a liar, on him is (the sin of) his lie: but, if he is telling the Truth, then will fall on you something of the (calamity) of which he warns you: Truly Allah guides not one who transgresses and lies!

We read in Tafsir Thalabi, Volume 8 page 272:

وكان يكتم ايمانه من فرعون وقومه خوفا على نفسه

"He was concealing his faith from Firon and his people because he feared for his life"

We should also point out the importance of the believer mentioned in the above verse:

'Abi Laila narrated that Allah's messenger (pbuh) said: 'The Sidiq (truthful) are three, Habib al-Najar the momin of al-Yasin who said {O my people! follow the messengers}, Hazqil the momin of al-Firon who said {Will ye slay a man because he says, 'My Lord is Allah' }, and Ali bin Abi Talib is the third and he is the most superior'
1. Fadael al-Sahaba, by Ahmad ibn Hanbal, v3, p96
2. Imam Suyuti in his book Jamea al-Saghir v2, p115 termed it 'Hasan'

3. Shawahid al-Tanzil, by Hasakani, v2, p306
4. Tatikh Dimashq, v42, p43
5. Al-Manaqib by Khawarezmi, p310
6. Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 13 page 326

5. Fourth Verse

In Surah Kahf, we read yet another example wherein the close servants of Allah [swt] performed Taqqiyah. Firstly it should be known that the people of Kahf (cave) have been referred to by Allah [swt] as one of His [swt] signs:

[Shakir 18:9] Or, do you think that the Fellows of the Cave and the Inscription were of Our wonderful signs?

Not only this, but the people of Kahf have been bestowed special grace by Allah [swt] as we read:

[Shakir 18:14] And We strengthened their hearts with patience

And then the Quran tells us the situation when they were resurrected:

[Shakir 18:19] And thus did We rouse them that they might question each other. A speaker among them said: How long have you tarried? They said: We have tarried for a day or a part of a day. (Others) said: Your Lord knows best how long you have tarried. Now send one of you with this silver (coin) of yours to the city, then let him see which of them has purest food, so let him bring you provision from it, and let him behave with gentleness, <u>and by no means make your case known to any one</u>: [Shakir 18:20] <u>For surely if they prevail against you they would stone you to death or force you back to their religion, and then you will never succeed.</u>

For any unbiased and rational mind, the underlined words of the Holy Quran shall be sufficient to teach the concept of Taqqiyah wherein one of the signs of Allah [swt] i.e. one of the people of Kahf practiced Taqqiyah in front of powerful opponents so that they may not force him back to their false religion. Despite this, Allah [swt] cites this Taqqiyah as 'success' which is not a success pertaining to world, but rather success in one's religion, the religion of Allah [swt].

Ibn Kathir records the following commentary:

(And let him be careful) meaning when he goes out buying food and coming back. <u>They were telling him to conceal himself as much as he could,</u> (and let no man know of you. For, if they come to know of you, they will stone you) means, `if they find out where you are,' (they will stone you or turn you back to their religion;) They were referring to the followers of Decianus, who they were afraid might find out where they were, and punish them with all kinds of torture until they made them go back to their former religion, or until they died, for if they agreed to go back to their (old) religion, they would never attain success in this world or the Hereafter. So they said:(and in that case you will never be successful.)

6. Fifth verse

Allah (swt) in Surah Qasas informs us of the methodology employed by the mother of Musa (as) to save her son from the harm of Pharaoh. When Musa (as) had been adopted by Asiya, his mother (as) began to express remorse and desired to be reunited with him. Allah (swt)

enabled this by providing a means via which his (as) mother and son would be reunited once more. This method was achieved via Taqiyyah adopted by the sister of Moses. Let us look at Surah Qasas verses 10-12 wherein this matter is discussed:

YUSUF ALI: And the heart of the mother of Moses became void, and she would have betrayed him if We had not fortified her heart, that she might be of the believers. And she said unto his sister: Trace him. So she observed him from afar, and they perceived not.
And We had before forbidden foster-mothers for him, so she said: Shall I show you a household who will rear him for you and take care of him?

The Sunni scholars in their commentaries of this verse have acknowledged that the sister said nothing that might attract Pharaoh's suspicions about the true identity of the baby. She did not mention the actual identity of the child, rather stated that she would put Pharaoh in contact with a household that would care for the child.

Maudoodi in his commentary of this verse said:

This shows that the sister did not go and sit back at home when she found that her brother had reached Pharaoh's palace, but cleverly hung about the palace to watch every new development. Then, when she found that the child was not taking to any nurse, and the queen was anxious to get a nurse who would suit it, the intelligent girl went straight into the palace, and said, "<u>I can tell you the whereabouts of a nurse, who will bring him up with great affection." .... Prophet Moses' sister did not say that she would bring a suitable nurse, but said that she would tell them of a house whose people would take up the responsibility of bringing him up with care and affection</u>.

The crucial thing we learn here is that the sister of Moses (as) adopted Taqiyyah, she hid the identity of the potential wet nurse to ensure that mother and child were reunited. Ibn Kathir in his commentary of this verse claims that the suspicions of Pharaoh were aroused, forcing the sister to strengthen her initial offer of assistance with a further example of Taqiyyah.

"… **When Musa had settled into the house of Fir`awn, after the king's wife had begun to love him and asked Fir`awn not to kill him, they brought to him the wet nurses who were to be found in their household, and he did not accept any of them, refusing to take milk from them. So they took him out to the marketplace, hoping to find a woman who would be suitable to nurse him. <u>When (his sister) saw him in their arms, she recognized him, but she did not give any indication nor did they suspect her</u>. …**
(she said: "Shall I direct you to a household who will rear him for you, and look after him in a good manner'') Ibn Abbas said: When she said that, they had some doubts about her, so they seized her and asked her, How do you know these people will be sincere and will care for him'' She said to them, "They will be sincere and will care for him because they want the king to be happy and because they hope for some reward.'' So they let her go. <u>After what she said, being safe from their harm, they took her to their house and brought the baby to his mother</u>. She gave him her breast and he accepted it, so they rejoiced and sent the glad tidings to the wife of Fir`awn.

None of the comments uttered by this sister were accurate; on the contrary they were stated to quash the suspicions that had appeared on the mind of Pharaoh. Had she told the truth at that point, her life as well as that of her infant brother would have come to an abrupt end, but she did not she hid the truth and uttered a false statement so as to convince Pharaoh that her intentions were genuine. Her uttering one thing whilst hiding the reality in her heart is a clear example of Taqiyyah. The Taqiyyah did not just end there. When Musa (as) was successfully suckled by his natural mother, his sister again sought eliminate any concerns as to why he was not successfully suckled by other wet nurses and automatically provided a reason for her

success compared to the other wet nurses. We read in Tafsir Jalalayn under the commentary of the same verse:

And We had forbidden him to [take to the breasts of] foster mothers from before, that is to say, we prevented him from taking to the breasts of any suckling mother other than his own mother. Therefore he would not accept the breasts of any of the foster-mothers brought for him. So she, his sister, said, 'Shall I show you a household — having seen their affection for him — who will take care of him for you, by having him suckled and so on, and who will act in good faith towards him? ' (the [suffixed] pronoun in lahu has been interpreted as referring to the king, as a response to them [when they asked Mary how she could be sure]). Her suggestion was accepted. So she brought his mother and he took to her breast. She explained to them that he had taken to her [breast] because of her pleasant scent and the wholesome taste of her milk.

If one brings these Tafseers together we learn that the sister of Musa (as) adopted Taqiyyah at three stages, namely when she:

1. offered to direct Pharaoh to a household that would suckle Moses (as)
2. eliminated suspicions raised about her offer by citing grounds that would please Pharaoh
3. explained why Musa (as) was attracted to the milk of this 'lady' and not that of others

If the sister had provided honest answers at any of these three points Musa (as) would have been killed, her adoption of Taqiyyah both protected Musa (as) and ensured that mother and son were reunited.

7. Difference between hypocrisy and Taqiyyah

Nawasib often try to equate Taqiyyah with hypocrisy, when both of these are two opposite extremes. Taqiyyah is concealing one's faith and displaying unbelief; while Hypocrisy is the concealment of unbelief and the displaying of belief. They are TOTAL opposites from the aspects of function, form, and meaning. The Holy Quran reveals the nature of hypocrisy with the following verse:

"When they meet those who believe, they say: `We Believe;' but when they are alone with their evil ones, they say: `We are really with you, we (were) only jesting [2:14]."

The Quran then reveals Taqiyyah with the following verses:

"A Believer, a man from among the people of Pharaoh, who had CONCEALED his faith, said: "Will ye slay a man because he says, `My Lord is Allah'?....[40:28]"

Also:

"Any one who, after accepting Faith in Allah, utters unbelief, EXCEPT under compulsion, his heart remaining firm in faith -- but such as open their breast to unbelief, -- on them is Wrath from Allah, and theirs will be a dreadful Chastisement [16:106]."

And also:

"Let not the believers take for friends or helpers unbelievers rather than believers: if any do that, (they) shall have no relation left with Allah except by way of precaution ("tat-taqooh"), that ye may guard yourselves ("tooqatan") from them....[3:28]"

If the stubborn Nawasib remains adamant that Taqqiyah is hypocrisy then he is openly negating the definitions given by Holy Quran, that is a grave sin.

8. The misuse of a Quranic verse by Nawasib

We have already presented several Quranic verses demonstrating the legitimacy of performing Taqiyyah in relevant circumstances, corroborated by commentaries of Sunni scholars. Despite this, there exist a group of deceitful Nawasib who use a verse of the Holy Quran and then incorrectly interpret it to evidence the prohibition on performing Taqiyyah.

> islamicweb.com states:
>
> Now I will finish of with this magnicificant ayah from the Quran which shows us that Taqayyah (deception, lying etc) is forbidden in Islam.. and the Shi'ites practice this Taqqayah on us Muslims!!! so dear Brothers and Sisters in Islam, Allah states in the Noble Quran: **"Surely those who hide from people the clear proofs and guidance, which we clarified in the Book (Qur'an), will be cursed by Allah and all those who curse."** (2:159)
>
> And the statement of the Prophet (s.a.w) who said: **"Whoever is asked for knowledge and conceals it will have a bridle of fire around his neck on the Day of Judgement."** (Abu Dawood, Tirmidhi)

http://islamicweb.com/beliefs/cults/shia_taqayyah.htm

9. Reply

We have already cited all those verses from the Holy Quran that prove the legitimacy of Taqiyyah. Some of these verses contain clear incidents of people performing Taqiyyah. Thus, the verse cited by Nawasib cannot be advanced as a prohibition on Taqiyyah, because that would mean a contradiction in Holy Quran that can never be the case. The deceitful Nawasib are trying to present the cited verse as a prohibition of Taqiyyah when the verse was revealed specifically for disbelievers who would conceal the Prophethood of Muhammad [s]. We read in Tafseer Tabari, Volume 2 page 72:

"Those who conceal the proof of guidance are the Jews rabbis and Christian scholars because they conceal from the people the matter of Muhammad"

We read in Tafseer Samarqandi, Volume 1 page 134:

"Revealed because of the head of Jews"

We read in Tafseer al-Wahidi, Volume 1 page 141:

"Meant by it the scholars of Jews"

If Nawasib still want to bring this verse as to 'prove' the prohibition of Taqiyyah then we should point out that the verse and also the tradition quoted by the Nawasib go against them.

According to the cited verse and Hadith the one who conceals knowledge when asked and hides clear guidance will be cursed by Allah [swt] and all those who curse and will have a bridle of fire around his neck on the Day of Judgment. In light of the Nawasib understanding of this verse we challenge them to apply the verse and Hadith to their revered Abu Hurraira who according to Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 3, Hadith Number 121 attested:

"**I have memorized two kinds of knowledge from Allah's Apostle . I have propagated one of them to you and if I propagated the second, then my pharynx (throat) would be cut (i.e. killed)".**

Nawasib need to pass their verdict on this practice of Abu Huraira in accordance with their interpretation of verse 2:159 and the tradition quoted by them from Tirmidhi and Abu Dawood, and declare that their most prolific Hadith narrator:

1. Is cursed by Allah [swt]
2. As a cursed person will have a bridle of fire around his neck on the Day of Judgment.

3. Chapter Three: The opinion of Sunni scholars on the legitimacy of Taqiyyah

Taqiyyah is a part of the religion of Islam. Its order has been revealed in the Quran. The Sunnah of Prophet Muhammad (s) has also testified to the legitimacy of Taqiyyah is Halal until the Day of Judgment. Imam Bukhari records in his Sahih:

The Statement of Allah:
"Anyone who after accepting faith in Allah utters unbelief except under compulsion his heart remaining firm in faith but such as open their breast to unbelief on them is Wrath from Allah and theirs will be a dreadful Penalty (16:106)]"

And this statement:

"Except if you are obliged to defend your self selves from them precautiously (3:28)" and this is Taqqiyah...
Allah excuses the weak who cannot refuse from leaving what Allah has enjoined on him. The coerced person cannot be but weak and unable to refuse to do what he is ordered to do.

Al-Hassan said: At-Taqiyya (speaking against one' own belief least his opponent put him in great danger) will remain till the day of Resurrection"
Sahih al-Bukhari [Arabic], Kitab al-Ikrah

In the commentary of Hassan Basri's statement, Shaykh Abulhadi al-Sindi records:

قوله : (التقية إلى يوم القيامة) أي : ثابتة إلى يومها لا تختصّ بعهده صلى الله عليه وسلّم .

His statement (Taqiyyah will remain till the day of resurrection) means that it will reamain till that day and it is not only specified for His [s] era'
Hashyat Sindi, Volume 4 page 94

Imam Fakhruddin al-Razi whilst mentioning the situations under which Taqqiyah is permissible records:

التقية جائزة لصون النفس ، وهل هي جائزة لصون المال يحتمل أن يحكم فيها بالجواز

Taqiyyah is permissible for self protection, but is it permissible for the protection of wealth? It probably is permissible.
Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 4 page 170

After recording the statement of Hasan Basri, Imam Fakhruddin al-Razi records:

عن الحسن : أنه قال التقية جائزة للمؤمنين إلى يوم القيامة ، وهذا القول أولى ، لأن دفع الضرر عن النفس واجب بقدر الإمكان .

"Taqiyyah is permissible until the day of Qayamah and this statement is better because it is Wajib to protect our life from any harm"
Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 4 page 170

Let us now read the belief of an esteemed Tabayee and Sunni Imam namely Shu'bi (d. 103 H). Remember that when Shu'bi died, it was the reign of tyrant's belonging to the Bani Ummayah. Imam Dhahabi in his authority work Siar alam al-Nubala, Volume 4 page 338 records about Sh'ubi:

4. Chapter Four: Nasibi criticisms of Taqqiyyah

No matter how many attempts the Nawasib and Khawarij make to present the belief of Taqiyyah as alien to Sunni Islam, historical evidence proves that people have always practised Taqiyyah irrespective of their sect. In this chapter we will explain the Shia tradition that Nawasib quote, in the light of some incidents found in Sunni books wherein people practiced Taqiyyah. These are not the only incidents but in the later chapters we will cite many more such incidents.

12. The Sahabah became 'Sahabah' thanks to their practicing Taqqiyah

It is indeed unfortunate that that Nawasib who comprise overwhelmingly of Sahabah worshippers attack the Islamic belief of Taqiyyah whilst history attests that the Sahabah they venerate actually became Sahabah (companions of Holy Prophet) because they practiced Taqiyyah and kept living amongst the infidels pretending to be one of them. Had they not practiced Taqiyyah:

- they would have been harmed severely or killed and hence never would have never benefited from the companionship of the Holy Prophet [s]
- the present day Nawasib would have had no one to venerate!

We read the following tradition in Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, Book 83, Number 5

Narrated Al-Miqdad bin 'Amr Al-Kindi:
An ally of Bani Zuhra who took part in the battle of Badr with the Prophet, that he said, "O Allah's Apostle! If I meet an unbeliever and we have a fight, and he strikes my hand with the sword and cuts it off, and then takes refuge from me under a tree, and says, 'I have surrendered to Allah (i.e. embraced Islam),' may I kill him after he has said so?" Allah's Apostle said, "Do not kill him." Al-Miqdad said, "But O Allah's Apostle! He had chopped off one of my hands and he said that after he had cut it off. May I kill him?" The Prophet said. "Do not kill him for if you kill him, he would be in the position in which you had been before you kill him, and you would be in the position in which he was before he said the sentence." <u>The Prophet also said to Al-Miqdad, "If a faithful believer conceals his faith (Islam) from the disbelievers, and then when he declares his Islam, you kill him, (you will be sinful). Remember that you were also concealing your faith (Islam) at Mecca before."</u>

Late Salafi scholar Maulana Waheed az Zaman Khan in his Urdu translation of the cited tradition, translated it in the following manner: **<u>"If a faithful believer conceals his faith from the disbelievers (practices Taqiyyah), and then when he declares his Islam…</u>"**

We read the following account of Abu Dhar [ra] coming into the pale of Islam in Sahih Bukhari, Volume 4, Book 56, Number 725:

Narrated Abu Jamra: Ibn 'Abbas said to us, "Shall I tell you the story of Abu Dhar's conversion to Islam?" We said, "Yes." He said, "Abu Dhar said: I was a man from the tribe of Ghifar. We heard that a man had appeared in Mecca, claiming to be a Prophet. ! said to my brother, 'Go to that man and talk to him and bring me his news.' He set out, met him and returned. I asked him, 'What is the news with you?' He said, 'By Allah, I saw a man enjoining what is good and forbidding what is evil.' I said to him, 'You have not satisfied me with this little information.' So, I took a waterskin and a stick and proceeded towards Mecca. Neither did I know him (i.e. the Prophet), nor did I like to ask anyone about him. I Kept on drinking Zam zam water and staying in the Mosque. Then 'Ali passed by me and said, 'It seems you are a stranger?' I said, 'Yes.' He proceeded to his house and I accompanied him. Neither

did he ask me anything, nor did I tell him anything. Next morning I went to the Mosque to ask about the Prophet but no-one told me anything about him. Ali passed by me again and asked, 'Hasn't the man recognized his dwelling place yet' I said, 'No.' He said, 'Come along with me.' He asked me, 'What is your business? What has brought you to this town?' I said to him, 'If you keep my secret, I will tell you.' He said, 'I will do,' I said to him, 'We have heard that a person has appeared here, claiming to be a Prophet. I sent my brother to speak to him and when he returned, he did not bring a satisfactory report; so I thought of meeting him personally.' 'Ali said (to Abu Dhar), 'You have reached your goal; I am going to him just now, so follow me, and wherever I enter, enter after me. If I should see someone who may cause you trouble, I will stand near a wall pretending to mend my shoes (as a warning), and you should go away then.' 'Ali proceeded and I accompanied him till he entered a place, and I entered with him to the Prophet to whom I said, 'Present (the principles of) Islam to me.' When he did, I embraced Islam 'immediately. He said to me, 'O Abu Dhar! Keep your conversion as a secret and return to your town; and when you hear of our victory, return to us. '…"

http://hadith.al-islam.com/Display/Display.asp?Doc=0&Rec=5397

13. People adopted Taqiyyah during the reign of the Banu Ummayya

Imam of Ahl ul Sunnah Allamah Dhahabi states:

"When Waleed ibn Abdul Malik bin Marwan came to power he entered the Mosque of the Prophet in Madina and saw an elderly man surrounded by people. Upon enquiry he discovered that the man was Saeed bin Musayyib. Waleed summoned Saeed but he did not go to him. This led to Waleed becoming furious. Amro bin Athim commented that during this time people practiced Taqiyyah and a few individuals in order to save Saeed bin Musayyib approached Waleed and pleaded with him, eventually Waleed abandoned his idea to kill Saeed"

Sira Alam al Nubla, Volume 4 page 227

It is clear from this tradition that during the Nasibi reign of the Banu Ummayya people adopted Taqiyyah to protect themselves. Allamah Dhahabi confirms this fact, and yet the Nawasib either through their ignorance or lies have sought to define this lawful practice as 'calculated deception'.

> Islamzine.com states:
>
> "He who conceals his religion has saved it, and he who makes it public has destroyed it."

Note that Islamzine had failed to even cite the source of this narration! What we know is that the Imam's comments on 'Taqiyyah' were said in answer to queries at a time when people were being oppressed. One needs to recognize that during the reign of the Banu Ummayya throughout their vast domain, Imam 'Ali (as) was openly cursed on the mosque pulpits. The Imams (as Imam Ali's direct descendants) and their adherents were likewise deemed the enemy of the State. What choice were the people left with? It was in such a situation that the Imams made clear comments endorsing Taqiyyah as legitimate, for to convey one's belief openly would have lead to serious consequences.

To prove our point we shall cite a tradition from Usul al Kafi that is incidentally often quoted by the Nawasib:

An individual by the name of Muammar bin Khalid asked Imam Abul Hasan (as) how to respond to oppressive rulers? He replied our forefather Imam Muhammad Baqir

stated: 'Taqiyyah is the religion of our forefathers. Whoever does not practice Taqiyyah has no Deen'.

Now, we would ask the Nawasib - Your own esteemed scholar Dhahabi had cited the episode involving Saeed bin Musayyib, and stated that during that time the people 'practiced Taqiyyah' - clearly these people must have learnt this practice from their forefathers, they must have adopted this practice based on someone's guidance. Why did these people with true faith respond to Waleed and the other Nasibi Banu Ummayya Khalifas by adopting Taqiyyah? Why did they not initiate jihad against them? Were all these individuals Shi'a? It should be remembered that this incident took place in Madina. Was this a calculated deception? Clearly not, these individuals were hiding their faith to protect their lives, in the same way that the Imams had advocated Taqiyyah as a way of protecting one's Deen.

> Islamzine.com states:
>
> "Nine tenths of religion is Taqiyyah (dissimulation), hence one who does not dissimulate has no religion." (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.110)

First of all, Nawasib should always consult their own books before bringing this tradition to mock at the Shia. We read in the esteemed Sunni work Kanz al Ummal:

Ali said: "One who does not practice Taqqiyah has no religion.'
Kanz al Ummal, Volume 3 page 96 Tradition 5665

Imam Ibn Abi Shaybah records a similar thing in his authority work Al-Musanaf, Volume 7 page 642 from Ibn al-Hanafiyah:

حدثنا وكيع عن إسرائيل عن عبد الأعلى عن ابن الحنفية قال: سمعته يقول لا إيمان لمن لا تقية له

Wakee narrated from Israel from Abdulala from ibn al-Hanafia who said: 'One who does not practice Taqqiyah has no Iman (faith)"

Wakee bin al-Jarah: *Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah**' (Taqrib al-Tahdib, v2 p283).* ***Israel bin Yunus:*** *Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah**' (Taqrib al-Tahdib, v1 p88).* ***Abdulala bin Amer:*** *Ibn Hajar said: '**Seduq**' (Taqrib al-Tahdib, v1 p551).*

Moreover the incident wherein Sahabi Hudaifah performed Taqiyyah before Uthman also proves that Taqiyyah in a certain context means to protect one's Deen (religion/faith). Imam Ibn Abi Shaybah records in Al-Musanaf, Volume 6 page 474:

دخل بن مسعود وحذيفة على عثمان فقال عثمان لحذيفة بلغني أنك قلت كذا وكذا قال لا والله ما قلته فلما خرج قال له عبد الله ما لك فلم تقوله ما سمعتك تقول قال إني اشتري ديني بعضه ببعض مخافة أن يذهب كله

Ibn Masud and Hudaifah entered on Uthman. Uthman said to Hudaifah: 'I have been informed that you said such and such thing'. Hudaifah replied: 'By Allah I didn't say that'. When they left, Abdullah (ibn Masud) said to him (Hudaifah): 'Why didn't you say to him what I had heard you saying about him?' Hudaifah replied: 'I protected my Deen so that I don't lose it'.

Secondly, this hadith also needs to be explained in terms of the context in which it was said. Islam had come as the all-encompassing Deen that would rule over the people, and thus ensure that they lived safe lives under the Sharia. Sadly, the situation at that time was so serious that tyrannical rulers were at the helm of the State, they dictated what the State religion was, and they had changed the entire face of the Deen. Religion had been turned on its head, and had in effect become unrecognizable, and to prove this we have the testimony of the Sahabi Malik bin Anas in Sahih Bukhari Volume 1 hadith number 507:

"Anas said, "I do not find (now-a-days) things as they were (practiced) at the time of the Prophet." Somebody said "The prayer (is as it was.)" Anas said, "Have you not done in the prayer what you have done?"

Narrated Az-Zuhri that he visited Anas bin Malik at Damascus and found him weeping and asked him why he was weeping. He replied, "I do not know anything which I used to know during the lifetime of Allah's Apostle except this prayer which is being lost (not offered as it should be)".

This well known Sahaba was testifying that the practices during the time of Rasulullah (s) had been completely lost, save Salat that was also now being changed. The question that we pose is, 'what were the Sahaba doing at this time?' Were they either endorsing these practices or had they simply gone underground and hidden their beliefs in their hearts? Clearly they must have also been practicing Taqiyyah. When our Imam (as) had declared that 9/10th of the Deen was Taqiyyah, it was because 9/10th of Deen that was being propagated by the State was NOT the Deen of Allah (swt), as had been vouched for by Malik - hence the actual 9/10th was hidden in one's hearts it was Taqiyyah. Anyone who did NOT practice Taqiyyah and had in fact embraced the State practices was NOT following the Deen of Allah (swt) i.e., "**one who does not dissimulate has no religion."**

> Islamzine.com states:
>
> "Mix with them (i.e. non-Shi'a) externally but oppose them internally." (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.116)

Perhaps these Nawasib could answer us this, if you live in country where the vast bulk of the people are non Muslim, and where very few adherents of your thinking live near you - worse still you are surrounded by those hostile to you, what is the best option for an individual to pursue? This problem is particularly acute in this day and age, indeed since September the 11th 2001, where Muslims living in the West are being deemed 'the enemy' - and are frowned upon by 'others' as terrorists / extremists / fanatics. The hatred vented against Muslims has lead to many going in to hiding fearing verbal and physical abuse. Tell us Nawasib, in such circumstances what is a Muslim to do?

To understand the comment of the Imam Sadiq (as) here let us cite the words of famed companion Abu Dardah recorded by Imam Bukhari in his Sahih:

It has been mentioned that Abu Darda said: "We give a smile for some people while our hearts curse them"
Sahih Bukhari, Volume 3 page 95

Most relevant in this case are the words of Ibn Masud recorded by Imam Ibn Hayan Andlasi in Tafseer Bahar al-Muheet, Volume 3 page 190:

قال ابن مسعود : خالطوا الناس وزايلوهم وعاملوهم بما يشتهون ، ودينكم فلا تثلموه.

Ibn Masud said: 'Live, compliance and behave with the people as they like but as for your religion, don't harm it'.

Then we have the following Hadith in Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 80:

Narrated 'Aisha:
A man asked permission to enter upon Allah's Apostle. The Prophet said, "Admit him. What an evil brother of his people or a son of his people." But when the man entered, the Prophet spoke to him in a very polite manner. (And when that person left) I said, "O Allah's Apostle! You had said what you had said, yet you spoke to him in a very polite manner?" The Prophet said, "O 'Aisha! The worst people are those

whom the people desert or leave in order to save themselves from their dirty language or from their transgression."

Also see Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 152.

The meaning here is that one is permitted to use diplomacy to get along with people. The above tradition was narrated when a person-sought permission to see the Holy Prophet (s) and prior to his asking permission the Prophet (s) said that he was not a good man, but still I shall see him. The Prophet talked to the person with utmost respect, upon which A'isha inquired as to why did the Prophet (s) talk to the person with respect despite his character, upon which the above reply was rendered.

Now look at the statements of Abu Dardah, Ibn Masud and Holy Prophet [s] and tell us as to what is the objection with the words of Imam Jafar Sadiq (as)? What is the difference between these three statements and the words of Imam Jafar Sadiq (as)?

14. Abdullah Ibn Umar practiced Taqiyyah in the presence of Mu'awiya

We read in Sahih al Bukhari (English translation) Volume 4 hadith number 434 that:

Ibn 'Umar said, "I went to Hafsa while water was dribbling from her twined braids. I said, 'The condition of the people is as you see, and no authority has been given to me.' Hafsa said, (to me), 'Go to them, and as they (i.e. the people) are waiting for you, and I am afraid your absence from them will produce division amongst them.' " So Hafsa did not leave Ibn 'Umar till we went to them. When the people differed, Mu'awiya addressed the people saying, "If anybody wants to say anything in this matter of the Caliphate, he should show up and not conceal himself, for we are more rightful to be a Caliph than he and his father." On that, Habib bin Masalama said (to Ibn 'Umar), "Why don't you reply to him (i.e. Mu'awiya)?" 'Abdullah bin 'Umar said, "I untied my garment that was going round my back and legs while I was sitting and was about to say, 'He who fought against you and against your father for the sake of Islam, is more rightful to be a Caliph,' but I was afraid that my statement might produce differences amongst the people and cause bloodshed, and my statement might be interpreted not as I intended. (So I kept quiet) remembering what Allah has prepared in the Gardens of Paradise (for those who are patient and prefer the Hereafter to this worldly life)." Habib said, "You did what kept you safe and secure (i.e. you were wise in doing so)."

So we see here:

1. Mu'awiya proclaimed his superiority to the Khilafath.
2. Ibn Umar disagreed and wished to highlight the truth openly before the people.
3. Ibn Umar chose not to challenge the claim as he was **"afraid that my statement might produce differences amongst the people and cause bloodshed**
4. Habib commented to Ibn Umar **"You did what kept you safe and secure (i.e. you were wise in doing so)."**

Ibn Umar's silence to prevent bloodshed and Habib's confirmation that he had adopted this stance to protect himself is clear proof that Ibn Umar was practicing Taqiyyah. Would Nawasib also deem this to be 'calculated deception' on the part of this Sahaba or was he practicing Taqiyyah in order to save his life and the lives of others? What is their fatwa here?

15. Why were the majority silent when 'Ali was cursed?

Allamah Anwar Shah Kashmiri in his work Faiz ul Bari Sharah Sahih Bukhari, Volume 2 page 359 highlights the following fact:

"The sunnah is to perform prayer before the sermon, but Marwan made it (the sermon) before the prayer because he used to abuse Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) and the people would get up and leave".

From history we learn that the sole individual that objected to this alteration was Abu Said al Khudri, and he openly spoke out against this change. This was a time when many of the Sahaba were still alive. No doubt they would have been fully aware that the Sunnah had been changed, so why did they remain silent on the matter? Tell us all Nawasib:

'When the rightly guided khalifa Ali (as) was being cursed from the Mosque pulpits (including the Mosque of the Prophet (s) in Madina) on the Day of Eid, and the State had made him the target of vilification, why did the majority remain silent?'

There can only be two reasons:

Either:

The majority (that comprised of the Sahaba and Tabayeen) considered the cursing of Ali bin Abi Talib (as) to be a virtuous act, if this is the case then we challenge Nawasib to pass their verdict on the majority at that time.

Or:

These individuals remained silent in the face of the tyrannical Banu Ummayya Nasibi rulers, and knew that speaking out would result in them losing their lives. They were therefore left with no other choice but to adopt Taqiyyah and remain silent. Clearly this option is the better one to accept, particularly for Nawasib, if their intention is to protect the status of Sahaba and other Muslims of that time.

Sunni scholar Amro bin Bahr Jahiz accepted this option writing in "al Bayan wa'l Tabayeen" page 29:

"The discussion of people is still alive who have lowered their eyes due to fear of the next world, and this has caused their tears to shed, and such people are in a state that some of them are either dispersed and separate or some are sitting alone being afraid or some are waiting, supplicating humbly, and are aggrieved. Taqiyyah has kept them silent".

The Imams from the Ahle bayt (as) were deemed a threat by the rulers of the time. They were conscious of the need to propagate the true teachings of Islam. Hence, it was important that they protected their lives as well as those of their followers. They therefore took the decision to adopt Taqiyyah as a necessary response to the difficult times they lived in.

16. Nasibi criticism to the Shia stance of praying behind the opponents in Taqiyyah

Azam Tariq states in Khutbaat e Jail pages 227 to 228:

Whoever in Taqqiyah performed salat with the opponents in the first lane, its like he performed Salat behind Holy Prophet [s]. Imam Jafar Sadiq has stated that whoever performed salat with the opponents in the first lane (because of Taqiyyah), its like he performed Salat in the first lance along

with Holy Prophet [s].(Ahsan al-Fawaid fi Sharah al-Aqaid, page 630)

17. Reply

Performing Salat in the way of opponents in Taqqiyah is not a belief that should be condemned by Nawasib. Such directions were given by the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] and the Ahle Sunnah during the oppressive tyrannical rule of the Bani Ummayah. Had the Nasibi mullah ever bothered to read the books of his school, he would have never made an attempt to mock the above cited belief. Imam of Ahle Sunnah Ibn Abdul Barr records in his famed work Al-Tamheed:

The Holy Prophet [s] asked Abu Dharr: 'How will you be when you will be ruled by rulers who will perform Salat belated?' Dharr said: 'Oh Holy Prophet [s]! What instruction do you give me?' Holy Prophet [s] replied: 'Just perform Salat at its time and if you find the time of Salat with those people, then perform (with them also), this will become your Nafal Salat'
Al-Tamheed, Volume 8 page 63

After recording similar kind of traditions, Ibn Abdul Barr states:

إنما صلى من صلى إيماء وقاعدا لخوف خروج الوقت وللخوف على نفسه القتل والضرب

'**People used to offer Salat through sign language and whilst sitting because of the fear missing the prayers timings (and if they perform it separately) then they feared being killed or injured'.**
Al-Tamheed, Volume 8 page 62

The Nasibi rulers of Bani Ummayah lead the Salat, therefore people hated offering Salat behind them and they opted to pray in their respective homes, but the cunning Nawasib used to take oath from the people to confirm that they had not performed prayers in their homes and should perform it with the rulers, that is why Ibn Abdul Barr records:

Rulers used to delay Salat during the days of Waleed bin Abdul Malik and they would take an oath from the people that 'they had not prayed (in their homes)'. When Abdullah bin Abi Zakariya came, an oath was taken from him that he had not performed Salat. He swore that he had not performed Salat, when he had actually prayed (in his home). When Makhul [one of the jurists of Syria] came, the same thing was done with him, to which he said: 'Why have we come here?' Thus, he was released.
Al-Tamheed, Volume 8 pages 62-63

The Imam of the Deobandies Muhammad Anwar Shah Kashmiri has likewise stated:

"There is no accountability if carelessness is shown in Salat in order to keep oneself safe from the oppression of cruel leaders. It has also been narrated from the Salaf that they would perform their prayers in their homes at the correct time and then for the purposes of avoiding sedition, they would then also perform prayers with the cruel leaders"
Anwar al-Bari, Volume 13 page 153

Such was the practice of common Muslims, but the Shi'a of Ahlulbayt [as] always attracted special attention from the Nasibi tyrants of Bani Ummayah, that necessitated a greater urgency to practice Taqiyyah. If people adopted this stance for the purpose of safeguarding the correct form of Islam and saving their lives and property, then logic demands a similar reward awaited them.

Azam Tariq al-Nasibi records in Khutbaat-e-Jail, page 290:

> Azam Tariq states:
>
> Mr. Khumeni in his book Tahreer al-Wasila, Volume 1 Kitan al-Salat while recording about the acts which make the Salat void stated:
>
> The second act which makes the Salat void is to put a hand over the other, the way people other than us Shias do but yes, there isn't any problem in doing so under Taqqiyah (page 186). The ninth act that voids the Salat is to deliberately say Ameen after Surah Fateha but it is permissible under Taqiyyah (page 190).

18. Reply

Nawasib should know that the main motive behind Taqiyyah is to save one's life, honor and property, it can be performed by resembling others in the method of prayers and other forms of worship. As we pointed our earlier, during the reign of the Bani Ummayh, even famed (Sunni) jurists disliked performing prayers behind them, but the cruel rulers would ensure that all notable individuals were present in the mosque. There were many amongst the Sahabah and Tabayeen who deemed Hajjaj bin Yusuf a Kafir or Fajir, and yet they prayed behind him under Taqiyyah. In this connection, whilst narrating the hostile conditions during the era of Hajjaj bin Yusuf, Allamah Abu Uthman Amro Bahar Jahaz (d. 255 H) records:

And when you gave an account regarding his (Anas bin Maliks') friendship with Hujjaj, indeed he certainly befriended Hujjaj and prayed behind him (in congregation) whilst considering him to be an infidel (kafir) let alone a deviant from the right path (fasiq). Thus with regards to seeking freedom / disassociation from him (al-bra'ah) and with regards to Taqiyyah, there is scope and in situations of fear (of loss of life, property.... etc) there is justification.
Kitab al-Uthmaniyah, page 153 (piblushed in Syria)

Imam of Nawasib Ibn Taymiyah has also recorded the fact that despite Hajjaj and Ibn Abi Ubaid being abominable, esteemed Sahabah and Tabayeen prayed behind them that proves that they practised Taqiyyah:

"**Abdullah bin Umar and others amongst the Sahabah would pray behind Hajjaj similarly the Sahabah and Tabayeen prayed behind Ibn Abi Ubaid who was engulfed with atheism and was an inviter towards misguidance"**
Majmoa Fatawa, Volume 3 page 281

Praying behind a Kafir and Fajir is of course unacceptable, yet esteemed Sahabah and Tabyeen reluctantly offered their prayers behind such rulers under Taqqiyah.

19. Azam Tariq's criticising the Taqqiyah of Imam Zayn al Abdeen [as]

> Azam Tariq states:
>
> Imam Zayn al Abdeen while praying in his house used to say '**Prayer is better than sleep'**.
> Moreover in this very book (Al-Istibsar) under the

> discussion of Adhan: 'Hussain bin Saeed narrated from Fadhala who narrated from Ala who narrated from Imam Baqir [as] that he used to say: 'My father Imam Zayn al Abdeen in his house during the Adhan of morning used to say 'Prayer is better than sleep' and if I do not say this even then there is no harm. All traditions of this kind in which the saying of 'Prayer is better than sleep' is mentioned are understood in respect of Taqqiyah.
>
> Khutbaat-e-Jail, page 307

20. Reply One – Taqqiyah is permissible

We should first of all point out that Shaykh Tusi did not cite the complete chains of narrations in Al-Istibsar and rather he quoted the remaining part of the chains in another book. Allow us to present the Arabic words of the tradition along with with the complete chain and correct English translation:

عن أبي جعفر عليه السلام قال : كان أبي ينادي في بيته بالصلاة خير من النوم ولو رددت ذلك لم يكن به بأس

Hussain bin Ubaidullah from Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Yahya al-Attar from his father from Muhammad bin Ali bin Mahbub from Ahmad bin Hassan from Hussain bin Saeed from Fudhalah from al-Alaa from Muhammad bin Muslim from Abi Jaffar [as] who said: 'My father used to call in his house: 'Prayer is better than sleep'. If you repeat that, there will be no problem'.
Al-Istibsar, Volume 1 page 308
Also in Al-Tahdeeb, Volume 2 page 63 Hadeeth Number 15

The word 'Adhan' does not appear in Arabic words of the tradition, therefore those Nawasib who make use of this tradition to prove that Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] believed in the recitation of Tathweeb i.e. the sentence 'Prayer is better than sleep' as the part of the Adhan, can not achieve their objective with this tradition. Unlike the Bidah introduced by the Salaf of Nawasib, according to the Shia view Tathweeb is not a part of the Adhan but there is no harm if someone says it away from the Adhan.

It should be known that Imam Zayn al Abdeen [as] led his life amongst the tyrants of Bani Ummayah who were staunch adherents of the Sunnah of the first three caliphs, and they bore a grudge against Ali bin Abi Talib [as]. They utilized spies to ascertain whether the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] were 'dissenting' from State-propagated religion. They would have increased their propaganda against the Imam [as] had they came to know of their deviation from the State-sponsored religion. Therefore, even if Imam Zayn al Abdeen [as] recited Tathweeb and that too, not as the part of Adhan, it should not be a problem.

We should also mention that some of the Shi'a scholars have not authenticated one of the narrators in the chain namely Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Yahya al-Attar as Sayyed Khoei declared him **Majhul** (Mu'ajam al-Rijal, v3 p123), Ibn Dawood said: '**Muhmal'** (Rijal ibn Dawood, p45), Jawahari said: '**His authentication is not proven therefore he is Majhul'** (al-Mufid, p46) and Sheikh Fayadh said: '**He is not authenticated'** (al-Aradi, p295).

21. Reply Two – Some other traditions on the topic

We will also take the opportunity to mention some other Shia traditions that the filthy Nawasib

use in order to prove that the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] believed in the Biddah of Tathweeb in Adhan which was introduced by the ancestors of the Nawasib. One of such traditions used by Nawasib is:

Muhammad ibn Ali ibn Mahbub from Ahmad ibn Al-Hassan from Al-Hussayn from Hammad ibn Isa from Shu'ayb ibn Ya'qub from Abu Basir: "Imam Jafar said: ... Al-Tathweeb (i.e. the statement of 'Al-Salat Khayron Min Al-Nawm') in Iqama is part of the Sunnat.
Al-Tahdeeb, Volume 2 page 62 Hadeeth Number 14

We should point out that Allamah Mirza Qumi declared this tradition weak in Minhaj al-Ahkam, page 179. Another tradition often used by Nawasib is from Wasa'el Al-Shia, Volume 5 page 427 Hadeeth number 6998:

"Imam Jafar (as) said: When you are in morning prayer say 'Al-Salat Khayron Min Al-Nawm' after 'Hayye Ala Khayr Al-Amal' in Adhan but don't say it in Iqama."

This tradition is taken from the book of ibn abi Nasr al-Bezanti who wrote his book when he was an adherent Waqifi Sect, therefore, any narrations recorded by him during that period are of no value and are accordingly rejected by the Shias. Sayyed Khoei said in Mujam al-Rijal, Volume 3 page 18:

"**He was Waqifi and then he returned."**

Moreover, such traditions are of no use when we have authentic Shia traditions from the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] that Tathweeb is not part of Sunnah and it was a Bidah introduced by the Nasibi rulers. We will quote the actual views of the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] in the next reply.

22. Reply Three – The interpretation of the cited tradition in the light of the actual views of Imams [as] about Tathweeb

Whilst mentioning the tradition cited by the Nasibi author, later Shia scholars such as Sayyed Sabzawari in his book Zakhirat al-Mead, Volume 1 page 257 are of the view that Shaykh Tusi was mistaken that Imam Zayn al Abdeen [as] adopted Taqiyyah when reciting the Tathweeb as he [as] didn't recite it as the part of Adhan but he [as] recited it before the adhan.

In the margin of al-Bahai al-Amili's book Al-Athna Ashria, page 52, Muhammad al-Hasoon wrote:

وبعض الأصحاب لم يحملها على التقية بل على قول ذلك في غير الآذان كقصد التنبيه

"**Some of our companions didn't consider it as Taqiyyah, but they deemed it an announcement other than in the Adhan"**

It would not be incorrect to reach such a conclusion about the tradition cited by the Nasibi author, when we have clear tradition from the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] about Tathweeb, for example we read in Bihar al-Anwar, Volume 81 page 173:

الصلاة خير من النوم بدعة بني أمية وليس ذلك من أصل الأذان ، ولا بأس إذا أراد الرجل أن ينبه الناس
للصلاة أن ينادي بذلك ، ولا يجعله من أصل الأذان

Imam Kazim [as] said: 'Prayer is better than sleep' is an innovation by the Bani Umaya, it is not a part of Adhan but there is no harm if a man wants to wake up the people by saying it, but without including it to the Adhan.

Moreover, we have the following authentic tradition in all four important canonical Shia works that suffice to to refute any attempt to prove that Imams of the Ahlulbayt [as] believed in the

Bidah of Nasibi Salaf:

Mu'awiyah ibn Wahab asked Imam as-Sadiq about the Tathweeb [saying 'Prayer is better than sleep' between the Adhan and the Iqamah. He said: "It is unknown to us."
1. Al-Kafi, Volume 3 page 303
2. Al-Faqih, Volume 2 page 63
3. Tahdeeb, Volume 2 page 63
4. Istibsar, Volume 1 page 308
5. Wasa'il, Volume 5 page 426
6. Shaykh Baqir Majlesi in Mirat al-Uqool, Volume 15 page 83 and Sayyed Rohani in Feqh al-Sadeq, Volume 4 page 329 have declared it Sahih.

23. Azam Tariq's criticising the difference of opinion among the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] on fiqh issues due to Taqiyyah

> Azam Tariq states:
>
> Imam Baqir (father) deems something Halal in Taqqiyah and then Imam Jafar (son) declared the very thing to be Haram. We read in Furu al-Kafi, Volume 2 page 80 (published in Lucknow) that (Abaan) Ibn Tughlab narrated that he heard Imam Jafar Sadiq [as]: 'My father used to give edicts during the time of Banu Umayah that the bird that has been killed by hawk or falcon was Halal. My father would practice Taqiyyah from Bani Ummayah but I don't and hence give the edict that the bird killed by hawk and falcon is Haram.
> See, Imam Baqir in Taqiyyah gave the edict for a Halal thing being Haram and that Taqqiyah was not due to fear but that was a Ijtihadi issue, such issues in Ijtihad were dissimilar among the jurists of Ahle Sunnah yet nobody used to criticize the other" [Khutbaat-e-Jail, page 287]

24. Reply

The tradition can be read at:
Usool al-Kafi, Volume 6 page 208

Right from the era of Umayyad and Abbasid rulers until today, all irreligious rulers deemed hunting an entertainment and they would hunt birds through dogs and bigger birds bred for hunting. Sometimes, the birds bred for hunting smaller birds would kill them during the hunt; despite this the pathetic rulers would still deem the killed bird as Halal to eat. The Ruler must have contacted Imam Baqir [as] to ascertain his edict on this issue. Had Imam Baqir [as] declared it Haram, the tyrants would have responded '**So you declare us to be Haram eaters!'** harmed and continued to believe it was Halal (as todays Nawasib do). What would be the logic behind endangering ones life before stubborn people who had no interest in adhering to Islamic principles and pretended to be the 'owners' of the religion? We would urge the Nawasib to ponder over the following chapter names found in the most authentic Hadith book of their school and then apply the stance of Imam Baqir [as] to these chapters:

"Whoever left some optional things, simple for the fear that some people may not be able to understand them and may fall into something more difficult"

And most importantly:

"Whoever selected some people to teach them (Religious) knowledge preferring them over others for fear that others may not understand it. And Ali said: 'You should preach to the people according to their mental caliber and that they may not convey wrong things about Allah and His apostle"
Sahih Bukhari, Volume 1 page 95

Why do Nawasib criticize the stance of Imam Baqir [as], when this wasn't something unique? You simply need to examine the pages of history, to see that number of great Sunni scholars that practiced Taqqiyah before the Abbasid ruler Mamun and hence issued an edict that supported his stance that the Quran was created. Allamah Shibli Numani in his biography of Mamun, records:

"The thing that had ruined all his merits was religious extremism. The influence of philosophy had made him Mutazili in some beliefs, that included the issue of the Quran being created, that had found a place in his heart with such intensity, that according to him, denying that belief constituted denying the Oneness of Allah [swt]. When he was present in one of the districts of Syria in 218 H, he sent an order to the governor Baghdad namely Ishaq Khazai, whose summary was:

"Ameer al-Momineen has come to know that almost all Muslims cannot understand the complexities of Islam, adhere to the belief of the Quran being eternal, whilst this view is refuted by various verses of Quran itself, such people are the worst of men and are the tongues of Iblis. All the jurists of Baghdad should be gathered and be aware of this commandment and whoever opposes it should be declared as Saqit al-Adalat"

Mamun wasn't satisfied by this alone, he then called seven huge scholars who possessed colossal authority in terms of Madhab, and talked to them face to face. All of them were opposed to Mamun on that issue but fearing the the sword, they said what their heart didn't comply with. When those people affirmed what Mamun had said, then he wrote another order to Ishaq to ascertain the view of all the scholars and religious leaders of the Islamic provinces. The order was implemented and the views of all the people were written by their specific wordings and were sent to Mamun. Whatever Mamun then wrote in reply to that, was his religious extremism. Amongst all the Muhadatheen and jurists, no one was spared from the accusation of being a briber, a thief, dishonest, ignorant or stupid. The orders also contained the strict command: 'Whoever doesn't abandon this belief should be sent with his legs shackled so that I will personally rule on whether they live or die, after they present their final views before me'

Ishaq announced this commandment in public, and a fear shattered the most extremely steadfast of people and all of them abandoned truth and impudence and adopted Mamun's view. Allamah Qawariri and Sajjad however remained steadfast to some extent, but when their legs were chained and were made to spend a night in that same condition. It was then proved that the pride that those people had regarding their commitment and resoluteness was incorrect, only Imam Ahmed and Muhammad bin Noah remained steadfast in this task and hence were sent to Tartus with their legs shackled. Mamun later came to know that those who had accepted the issue had actually practiced Taqiyyah, he became furious and ordered those people to be summoned, that comprised of a massive gathering that included Abu Hasaan Ziyadi, Nadhr bin Shameel, Qawariri, Abu Nadhar, Tamar, Ali bin Maqatil,

Bashar bin al-Waleed etc"
Al-Mamun, page 162-163 (Published by Daarul Ishaat, Karachi)

Let us shed light on some of the Sunni jurists mentioned above. Qawariri (d. 235H), about whom Imam Dhahabi said: '**Amongst the big scholars of Baghdad'** (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v2 p439). Al-Nadhr bin Shameel (d. 204 H) about whom Imam Dhahabi said: '**Imam Hafiz Allamah…the scholar of Marw (city)'** (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v1 p314). Abu Hasaan al-Ziyadi (d. 242 H) who has been decalred by Imam Dhahabi as '**Imam Allamah Hafiz, the historian of the time, the judge of Baghdad'** (Siar alam alnubala, v11 p496). Bashar bin al-Waleed (d. 238 H) about whom Dhahabi stated: '**Imam Allamah, truthful Hafiz, the judge of Iraq'** (Siar alam alnubala, v10, p673).

The above incident of Mamun proves that there is no benefit in risking one's life and honor before a stubborn tyrannical ruler, no matter what edict you give him. Coming back to the issue of eating a bird that has been killed by hunting birds (falcon, eagle and other such birds), we should remember that the Imamate of Imam Jafar Sadiq [as] was during the downfall of the Banu Ummayah and the rising of Banu Abbasiyah. Hence the Banu Ummayah's attention was diverted from the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] and focused on resisting the Banu Abbasiyah. It became a bit easier for Imam Jafar [as] to talk about the innovations of Banu Ummayah, and he [as] then got the opportunity to spread the true teachings of the Ahlulbayt [as]. That's is why Imam Jafar Sadiq [as] said that he didn't perform Taqiyyah at that point in time.

According to another tradition of Imam Jafar [as] recorded in Al-Kafi, Volume 6 page 208:

Abi Ubaida al-Hada said: 'I asked Abu Abdullah [as]: 'What you say about the hawk, falcon and eagle?' He replied: 'If you can slaughter (the prey) before it dies, so you can eat it, but if you cant slaughter it then don't eat it.'
Majlesi said: 'Hasan' (Mirat al-Uqool, v21 p343)

In contradiction to this, according to Ahle Sunnah the bird that does of injuries inflicted by a hunting bird, is Halal to eat. We read in Noor al-Hidayah (the Urdu translation of Sharah Waqaya), Volume 4 page 85:

"If a falcon eats some flesh from the prey then it is permissible to eat that flesh, but according to the madhab of Ahlulbayt it is absolutely Haram"

After making all this discussion, we should point out that the tradition quoted by the Nasibi author from Al-Kafi is not reliable as Shaykh Majlesi graded it weak in Mirat al-Aqul, Volume 21 page 343.

25. Azam Tariq's criticism to the change in edict by Imam [as] due to Taqiyyah

Under the heading '**A change in a decision on a matter for few seconds, a strange attitude of Imam Jafar Sadiq [as]'** the following tradition is quoted:

> Azam Tariq states:
>
> Salmah bin Maharaz states that it was asked from Imam Jafar Sadiq [as]: 'There was an Armanian man, who died and made me the executor of his inheritance'. Imam asked: 'Who is called Armani?'. I replied: 'There is a nation lives on mountainous region, and what you have to do with this, the issue is that he died and made me the executor of his inheritance and he has left a daughter behind him.' Imam Said: 'Give half to

the daughter'. Salmah said that he mentioned the edict to Zararah to which he said: 'Imam has practiced Taqiyyah from you, just give full to the daughter'. After hearing this Salmah then went to the Imam and said: 'May Allah improve your situation, our companions state that you had practiced Taqiyyah' Imam replied: 'By Allah, I didn't practice Taqiyyah 'with' you but I did it 'for' you so that you may not have to give ransom. Has anyone got to know about this edict?'. Salmah said: 'No'. Imam said: 'Alright, give the rest of the property to the daughter also'.

26. Reply

The tradition quoted by the Nasibi can be read at:
Usool al-Kafi, Volume 7 page 86

Firstly, Shaykh Majlisi graded the tradition as Majhul (Mirat al-Uqul, v23 p132). That means it would be futile to waste time on explaining such a tradition and answering the criticism of Nasibi Azam Tariq on Imam Jafar [as] for altering his fatwa. Whilst this tradition cites the change in Imam Jafar's fatwa on account of Taqiyyah, that he [as] did 'for' the appointed Wasi of a deceased man, we see that Caliph Umar altered his fatwa due to ignorance about the the actual rules and regulations on a particular issue. Let us cite one such example from Sunan Abi Daud Book 38, Number 4385:

Narrated Ali ibn AbuTalib:
Ibn Abbas said: A lunatic woman who had committed adultery was brought to Umar. He consulted the people and ordered that she should be stoned. Ali ibn AbuTalib passed by and said: What is the matter with this (woman)? They said: This is a lunatic woman belonging to a certain family. She has committed adultery. Umar has given orders that she should be stoned. He said: Take her back. He then came to him and said: Commander of the Faithful, do you not know that there are three people whose actions are not recorded: a lunatic till he is restored to reason, a sleeper till he awakes, and a boy till he reaches puberty? He said: Yes. He then asked: Why is it that this woman is being stoned? He said: There is nothing. He then said: Let her go. He (Umar) let her go and began to utter: Allah is most great.

Although this should suffice to silence the Nasibism of our opponents allow us to present similar tendencies exhibited by their revered Imam Abu Hanifa who altered changes in the fatwa issued by him. We read the following account in Tarikh Baghdad, that has been declared as 'Sahih' by Sheikh Bashar Awad Maroof, the margin writer of the book:

وقال زفر: " كنا نختلف إلى أبي حنيفة ومعنا أبو يوسف ومحمد بن الحسن فكنا نكتب عنه، فقال يوما لأبي يوسف: ويحك يعقوب! لا تكتب كل ما تسمعه مني، فإني قد أرى الرأي اليوم فأتركه غدا، وأرى الرأي غدا فأتركه بعد غد

Zafar Said: We used to dispute (over verdicts) and would visit Abu Hanifa (to solve the problem) and with us were Abu Yusuf and Muhammad ibn al-Hassan. We would write to him and one day he (Abu Hanifa) said to Abu Yusuf: 'Woe onto you o Yaqoob! Do not record my verdicts which you hear directly from me because I decide on something today, then I change later on and at a later date I shall change my decision again'
Tarikh Baghdad, Volume 13 page 424

27. Azam Tariq's criticism of the Imamate of Imam Jafar Sadiq [as]

In Khutbaat-e-Jail, pages 289-290 The filthy Nasabi wrote a title namely '**Imam Jafar used to deny his Imamate openly'** and then records a tradition from al-Kafi, page 142 whose summary is:

> Azam Tariq records:
>
> Two men from Zaidiyah sect came to Imam Jafar Sadiq [as] and asked: 'Are you Imam Muftaraz al-Ta'ya [Imam whose obedience is obligatory]?' Imam replied: 'No'. They said: 'Some reliable men of your side have told us that you say so. They are such and such people. They are pious people and do not lie'. Imam got furious and said: 'I didn't tell instruct them about it'. Later, both of those men went form there'

28. Reply

The tradition has often been used in the very manner by the Nawasib. By failing to quote the remainder of the tradition the Nasibi author adhering to his ancestral habit of deceit sought to prove that Imam Jafar [as] denied that he was the Imam. Allow us to expose his deceit by citing the remainder of the text:

Thus, Imam [as] asked Saeed bin Asamaan: 'Do you recognize these two?'. He said: 'Yes, these are among the people of our market and belong to Zaidiyah sect, and both of these believe that the sword of Holy Prophet [s] is possessed by Abdullah bin al-Hasan (the one who has the sword is Imam Muftaraz al-Ta'a)'. Imam [as] said: 'These accursed men tell a lie. Neither Abdullah bin has ever even saw that sword from his eyes, nor his father. But if his father had seen that word with Ali bin al-Hussain then that is possible. If these people are truthful then they should tell the sign present at the handle of the sword and what signs are there on its blade? The sword of Holy Prophet [s] is with me, his [s] Raya and armor are with me..., in Bani Israil, the one who had Tabut in his house used to get Nabuwat while among us, the one who has the weapon of Holy Prophet [s] get Imamate....'
al-kafi, Volume 1 page 232

The Nasibi author didn't bother to cite this portion of the tradition according to which Imam Jafar [as] unequivocally presented the evidences of his Imamate. Logically, the two men of the Zaidiyah Sect may have been thugs that frequented the market place. Hence, by their initial tone of conversation, Imam [as] was able assess their nature and accordingly applied in the negative to avoid being exposed to vile behavior. Taqiyyah in order to save one's honor is performed in this manner.

Shaykh Majlesi records about this tradition:

"**This tradition is Majhul. He [as] stated 'No' , the denial was in Taqiyyah"**
Mirat al-Uqool, Volume 3 page 41

5. Chapter Five: Innovations in Taqiyyah introduced by Ibn Taymiyah

The instructions in the Quran and Sunnah are so clear that Nawasib can never claim that Taqiyyah is Haram in Islam. Despite this, the Nawasib close links with the Khariji cult who (as we previously mentioned) vehemently reject Taqiyyah, have forced them to muddy this Islamic belief due to their hatred for the Shi'a of Ahlulbayt [as]. The result is these enemies of Allah devised an alternative 'satanic plan' to destroy the religion of Allah [swt] and introduced 'INNOVATIONS' in the Islamic doctrine of Taqiyyah and amend it according to their own whims and desires.

In this chapter and the next, we shall examine innovations in the understanding of Taqiyyah by two pathetic Nasibi scholars namely:

- Ibn Taymiyah (Sheikh-ul-Islam of the Salafies)
- Mufti Khalid Mahmood (The most well-known Mufti and Munazir [debater] of Sipah Sahaba, the followers of Deoband sect)

During the early centuries, the Nawasib flatly rejected the notion that there was an 'order' of Taqiyyah under the Islamic Sharia. Alhamdolillah, they were successfully refuted by the Shi'a Ulema, who presented clear Qur'anic verses as well as Ahadith of Rasul (s). Then came Ibn Taymiyah, who devised the following two conditions (innovations) into the Islamic Sharia:

1. Taqiyyah can only be done in front of the Kuffar, not before a Muslim (even against tyrant Muslim Rulers)
2. Whilst practising Taqiyyah, one cannot tell a 'LIE' but must remain silent.

In this chapter we will refute the Bidah (innovations) of Ibn Taymiyah with respect to the doctrine of Taqiyyah while the innovations of Mufti Khalid Mahmood will be refuted in subsequent chapters.

29. Ibn Taymiyah's commentary on verse [3:28]

In the chapter where we cited Quranic proofs for the legitimacy of practicing Taqqiyah, we had discussed a verse, let us see the verse once again:

لاَّ يَتَّخِذِ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الْكَافِرِينَ أَوْلِيَاء مِن دُوْنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَمَن يَفْعَلْ ذَلِكَ فَلَيْسَ مِنَ اللّهِ فِي شَيْءٍ إِلاَّ أَن تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تُقَاةً وَيُحَذِّرُكُمُ اللّهُ نَفْسَهُ وَإِلَى اللّهِ الْمَصِير

[Yusufali 3:28] Let not the believers Take for friends or helpers Unbelievers rather than believers: if any do that, in nothing will there be help from Allah: except by way of precaution, that ye may Guard yourselves from them. But Allah cautions you (To remember) Himself; for the final goal is to Allah.

Here is the commentary by Ibn Taymiyah:

The verse (3:28) is not only an exception but also a restricted exception. Not only is it forbidden to be used against Muslims but it prohibits lying to others. What it means is that if you oppose certain conduct and you are in a situation where condemnation would endanger Islam or the Muslim community you can keep silent but must avoid lying.
1. Ibn Taymiyah, Minhaj, Vol. 1 p. 213
2. Ibn Kathir, Tafseer of verse 3:28

In the above Fatwa, Ibn Taymiyah introduced two conditions (innovations) of the Islamic Sharia. He asserted that:

1. Taqiyyah can only be exercised in the presence of Kafirs, it cannot be practiced before a cruel Muslim king.
2. Whilst practicing Taqiyyah one can maintain silence, but must not lie.

30. Reply one

It is pure conjecture on the part of Ibn Taymiyah to suggest that lying is prohibited under Taqiyyah or that it can only be practiced against the Kuffar. There is not a single proof for these innovations from the sources of the Shari'ah. The reality is there is not a single:

- verse of the Quran that prescribes these conditions;
- saying or practice of Rasul (s), that stipulates these conditions;
- not even a single Sahabi understood Taqiyyah along with these conditions (they practiced contrary to these conditions, as we will show shortly later on. Insha-Allah);
- no Sunni scholar from the early centuries added these conditions in Taqiyyah.

We invite the Nasabis to prove the innovations of Ibn Taymiyah from the above 4 sources. Contrary to Ibn Taymiyah's claim, all of these sources refute his assertion

31. Reply Two: The Qur'an refutes Ibn Taymiyah

[Yusufali 16:106] Any one who, after accepting faith in Allah, utters Unbelief,- except under compulsion, his heart remaining firm in Faith - but such as open their breast to Unbelief, on them is Wrath from Allah, and theirs will be a dreadful Penalty.

As you see, the Qur'an states 'uttering unbelief' which does not mean keeping silence. Uttering means either saying or acting something in contrary to ones belief. What lie is bigger than uttering unbelief? The onus is on the Nawasib to show us these two conditions (innovations) of Ibn Taymiyah from the Quran.

32. Reply Three: The Sunnah of Rasul Allah (s) refutes Ibn Taymiyah

We have the following Hadith in Sahih Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 80:

Narrated 'Aisha:
A man asked permission to enter upon Allah's Apostle. The Prophet said, "Admit him. What an evil brother of his people or a son of his people." But when the man entered, the Prophet spoke to him in a very polite manner. (And when that person left) I said, "O Allah's Apostle! You had said what you had said, yet you spoke to him in a very polite manner?" The Prophet said, "O 'Aisha! The worst people are those whom the people desert or leave in order to save themselves from their dirty language or from their transgression."

The meaning here is that one is permitted to use diplomacy to get along with people. The above tradition was narrated when a person-sought permission to see the Holy Prophet (s) and prior to his asking permission the Prophet (s) said that he was not a good man, but he would still see him. The Prophet talked to the person with utmost respect, upon which Aisha inquired as to why the Prophet (s) talked to the person respectfully despite his ill character, upon which the above reply was rendered.

So, here Rasul Allah (s) himself practised Taqiyyah in front of the so called Sahaba (i.e. Muslims). Moreover, he also 'ordered' Aisha (and others) to practice Taqiyyah (i.e. Diplomacy) in such situations.

Again the onus is on the Nawasib to provide evidence from the Sunnah of Rasul Allah (s) for the conditions / innovations of Ibn Taymiyah. On our part we shall highlight the actions of some Sahaba, and prove how they practised Taqiyyah, by lying before Muslims.

33. Reply Four: Imam Hassan's [as] words refute Ibn Taymiyah

Ibn Asakir records that Imam Hasan [as] once said:

"**Pity on you! Taqiyyah is a door of exit for Muslims, whenever it is required and there is a fear of a dominant person then one should practice Taqqiyah and just say the opposite of whatever is in heart, in this manner, one is saved from being accountable before Allah"**
Tahdeeb, Volume 1 page 168

While defining Taqiyyah, Imam Hassan [as] clearly stated to 'say the opposite of whatever is in heart' that comprehensively refutes the innovations introduced by Ibn Taymiyah according to which one cannot tell a lie in Taqiyyah.

34. Reply Five: Imam Fakhruddin al-Razi Vs Ibn Taymiyah

Similar to the words of Imam Hasan [as] we read above, Imam of Ahle Sunnah Fakhruddin al-Razi also stated the following while talking about Taqiyyah in his Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 4 page 170:

بل يجوز أيضاً أن يظهر الكلام الموهم للمحبة والموالاة ، ولكن بشرط أن يضمر خلافه

"Nay it is also permissible to say words which shows loyalty and love but on a condition to believe (in the heart) the opposite"

35. Reply Six: Talha and Zubair Vs. Ibn Taymiyah

Both Talha and Zubair administered the oath of allegiance (Bayya) on the hand of Maula Ali [as]. Tragically, afterwards they broke the Bayya, fled to Makka and joined Aisha where they instigated a movement against Maula 'Ali (as). Now, when the Shi'a object to their breaking the Bayya, and our labeling them Baghis, then do you know how Nawasib (particularly the Nawasib belonging to Sipah Sahaba) defend Talha and Zubair? They assert that Talha and Zubair were compelled to make bayya, but they did not do it with their hearts, so they cannot be deemed rebels. Just look at the book 'Barat-e-Uthman' which has been published on the website of Sipah Sahaba:
http://www.kr-hcy.com

The first ones, who gave the oath of allegiance at the hands of Ali (after the murder of Uthman), were the killers of Uthman. Then some of Ahle-Madina (natives of city Madina) gave oath of allegiance at their own will, and some of them gave it under the pressure of Uthman's killers. So, when Hadhrat Talha and Zubair came to Makka after escaping from Madina and started collecting army against Ali, then someone asked them: "Both of you have already given oath of allegiance at the hands of Ali". Upon this, they replied: "We gave oath of allegiance in a state that swords were

hanging over our necks".
[Baraat Uthman, Page 50, by Zafar Ahmad Uthmani]

[Note: This is incorrect. According to authentic traditions, Talha and Zubair were the first who gave Bayya upon the hands of Maula Ali (as) willingly, while hoping that they also get some share in power. But when they saw no favor by Maula Ali (as), then they turned against him and ran away to Makka. And when in Makka people asked them about their oaths, it was then that they fabricated this excuse in order to defend themselves]

Need we to comment any more?

Why don't Nawasib apply the fatwa of Ibn Taymiyah on Talha and Zubair (and all those Ahle-Madina, who gave Bayya to Ali 'under the pressure' of Uthman's killers)? If the Nawasib still claim that Taqiyyah of Talha and Zubair was justified, then they have to tell us:

1. do the Nawasib think that Maula Ali (as) was (naudobillah) a Kaffir?
2. lying is one thing. What about lying after administering an oath of allegiance, pledging fealty to the Caliph?

Why didn't Ibn Taymiyah pass his Fatwa against Talha and Zubair and deem them hypocrites (Munafiqeen) before declaring Shias as Munafiq for practising Taqiyyah before cruel Muslim Kings? Or is it that Ibn Taymiyah thought that (nauda'billah) Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as] was a kafir ruler? Ibn Taymiyah had attested that in Taqiyyah, one can maintain silence but cannot lie, whilst his beloved Sahabah Talha and Zubair lied before Maula Ali (as) having giving their pledge of loyalty to him.

36. Reply Seven: Why did Umar practice Taqiyyah before his subjects - were they kaafir?

We read in Sahih al-Bukhari, Arabic-English version, vol 9, p212: {Between Traditions 9.281 and 9.282}:

(21) CHAPTER. If a judge has to witness in favor of a litigant when he is a judge or he had it before he became a judge (can he pass a judgment in his favor accordingly or should he refer the case to another judge before whom he would bear witness?). And the judge Shuraih said to a person who sought his witness, "Go to the ruler so that I may bear witness(before him) for you." And 'Ikrima said, "Umar said to 'Abdur-Rahman bin 'Auf, 'If I saw a man committing illegal sexual intercourse or theft, and you were the ruler (what would you do)?. 'Abdur-Rahman said, 'I would regard your witness as equal to the witness of any other man among the Muslims. 'Umar said, 'You have said the truth.' 'Umar added: If I were not afraid of the fact that people may say that 'Umar has added to the Quran extra (verses), I would have written the Verse al-Rajm (stoning to death of married adulterers) with my own hands.
[Sahih Bukhari, Volume 9 pages 212-213]

These filthy Nawasib attack the Shias for practicing Taqiyyah in the presence of Muslims. We say that this is permissible if it means protecting oneself from hardship. The Nasibi shall no doubt reject such a notion, so we present this reference before them. Why was Umar the brave Khalifa practicing Taqiyyah? Not only does this reference demonstrate that Umar ascribed to Tahreef of the Qur'an, he also practiced Taqiyyah by not putting things right stating: 'If I were not afraid of the fact that people may say that 'Umar has added to the Quran extra (verses)'.

This reference points to the fact that Umar had a kufr belief and was seeking to hide this from the people by practising Taqiyya. If the Nawasib claim that the Shi'a practice Taqiyya as and when they feel like, it has nothing to do with fear, then could they kindly explain why their khalifa was practising Taqiyya from the people? What fear would the powerful khalifa have, that

would force him to practice Taqiyyah, or would the Nawasib deem it a 'calculated deception'?

The comments recorded by Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti are relevant to read which we read in Al Itqan fi Uloom al Quran (Urdu), Volume 2, page 67 (published by Idara e Islamiya, Lahore):

"About the statement of Umar i.e "If I were not afraid of the fact that people may say that 'Umar has added to the Qur'an extra verses, I would have written the Verse al-Rajm with my own hands" Abu Bakar Razi has written in his book 'Al Burhan': 'The literal words of this statement prove that it is permissible [Jaiz] to write down those words in the Quran, and it was the fear of people which stopped Umar from this writing this in the Mushaf and sometimes it happens that obstacles appear between permissible things and since the writing the verse of stoning was permissible hence it is obvious that its recitation is also proven."

Al Itqan (Urdu), Volume 2, page 67

37. Reply Eight: Was Muawiyah a Kafir Ruler? [Ibn Taymiyah vs. Muawiyah]

We read in Sahih al Bukhari (English translation) Volume 4 hadith number 434 that:

Ibn 'Umar said, "I went to Hafsa while water was dribbling from her twined braids. I said, 'The condition of the people is as you see, and no authority has been given to me.

'Hafsa said, (to me), 'Go to them, and as they (i.e. the people) are waiting for you, and I am afraid your absence from them will produce division amongst them.' " So Hafsa did not leave Ibn 'Umar till we went to them. When the people differed, Muawiya addressed the people saying, "If anybody wants to say anything in this matter of the Caliphate, he should show up and not conceal himself, for we are more rightful to be a Caliph than he and his father." On that, Habib bin Masalama said (to Ibn 'Umar), "Why don't you reply to him (i.e. Muawiya)?" 'Abdullah bin 'Umar said, "I untied my garment that was going round my back and legs while I was sitting and was about to say, 'He who fought against you and against your father for the sake of Islam, is more rightful to be a Caliph,' but I was afraid that my statement might produce differences amongst the people and cause bloodshed, and my statement might be interpreted not as I intended. (So I kept quiet) remembering what Allah has prepared in the Gardens of Paradise (for those who are patient and prefer the Hereafter to this worldly life)." Habib said, "You did what kept you safe and secure (i.e. you were wise in doing so)."

So we see here:

- Mu'awiya proclaimed his superior claim to the Khilafat.
- Ibn Umar disagreed and wished to highlight the truth openly before the people.
- Ibn Umar chose not to challenge the claim as he was "afraid that my statement might produce differences amongst the people and cause bloodshed"
- Habib commented to Ibn Umar "You did what kept you safe and secure (i.e. you were wise in doing so)."

Ibn Umar's silence to prevent bloodshed and Habib's confirmation that he had adopted this stance to protect himself is clear proof that Ibn Umar was practicing Taqiyyah. Would the najis Nawasib belonging to Sipah-e-Sahaba now declare Muawiyah a Kaffir ruler?

There is another incident wherein the followers of Imam Hasan [as] suggested that he adopt Taqiyyah before Mawiyah:

Hasan said: "Be informed that Mu'awiya has called us to such a treaty that is neither honorable nor is based on justice. If you are ready for death then we will reject this offer, and answer the matter with our swords and leave the matter with Allah. If you like life then we can accept it. Upon saying this, the calls from all around were 'Taqiyyah, Taqiyyah' when the people left Hasan, he made peace".
Siyar Alam Nubla, Volume 3 page 269

38. Reply Nine: Sahabi Hudaifah performed Taqiyyah before Uthman

In the following incident recorded by Imam Ibn Abi Shaybah in Al-Musanaf, Volume 6 page 474, we learn that a Sahabi practiced Taqiyyah before another ruler Sahabi by telling a lie and this shall also be a sufficient proof to water down the Biddah introduced by Ibn Taymiyah:

دخل بن مسعود وحذيفة على عثمان فقال عثمان لحذيفة بلغني أنك قلت كذا وكذا قال لا والله ما قلته فلما خرج قال له عبد الله ما لك فلم تقوله ما سمعتك تقول قال إني اشتري ديني بعضه ببعض مخافة أن يذهب كله

Ibn Masud and Hudaifah entered on Uthman. Uthman said to Hudaifah: 'I have been informed that you said such and such thing'. Hudaifah replied: 'By Allah I didn’t say that'. When they left, Abdullah (ibn Masud) said to him (Hudaifah): 'Why didn’t you say to him what I had heard you saying about him?' Hudaifah replied: 'I protected my Deen so that I don’t lose it'.

39. Reply Ten: Imam Zuhri Vs Ibn Taymiyah

Modern day Sunni scholar Professor Dr. Tahir ul Qadri in his book ‘The Ghadir Declaration’ page 78 records this tradition from Ibne Athir in Asadul Ghabah fi Marifat as-Sahaba, Volume 1 pages 572-573:

It is narrated by the Zuhri that Ibn junayd ibn amr bin mozir said "I heard the prophet said whose deliberately lied about me will go to hell straightaway. I have heard myself or may I grow deaf in both ears. the prophet returned from hajutal widah and addresses the people,. He said while holding Ali's hand; one who has me as his guardian has Him (Ali) as his guardian. O'Allah befriend him who befriends him (Ali) and be his enemy who is his (Ali's) enemy.

Ubaidullah said: I said to Zuhri; dont say these things in Syria, otherwise you will hear so much against Ali that your ears will get soar. (in reply) Zuhri said; By God! there are so many qualities of Ali that are save with me that if I wrote them, I may be murdered.
The Ghadir Declaration, page 78 Hadith 49

Comment

Imam Zuhri was practicing Taqiyyah for whom? Christians / Jews? Clearly not, why would they kill him if he narrated the virtues of Ali bin Abi Talib [as]? Clearly, Zuhri's silence was because he feared the Nawasib of Syria, here is a major Sunni scholar practicing Taqiyyah before Muslims. So was Zuhri a kaafir?

40. Reply Eleven: Imam Bukhari Vs Ibn Taymiyah

Sunni scholar Mufti Ghulam Rasool tried his best to defend his Imam Bukhari whilst addressing the criticism of Abu Zahra that Imam Bukhari did not take Hadith from Imam Sadiq (as), he

states as follows:

It was not just Imam Sadiq (as) that Imam Bukhari refrained from taking Hadith from, he did not take any from four of the pure Ahlulbayt Imams who existed during his lifetime, namely:
The eighth Imam Ali Raza (as) (d. 208 H), this was that Imam that at one time in Nisahbur had more than twenty thousand scholars who benefited from listening to and sought permission to narrate Hadith, attendees included high ranking Muhadatheen such as Hafiz Abu Zurai Razi (d.264 H), Hafiz Muhammad Aslam Tusi (d.242 H) Ishaq bin Rahwiyah (d.264 H) etc.
The ninth Imam, Imam Taqi (as) (d. 220 H)
The tenth Imam, Imam Naqi (as) (d.245 H)
The eleventh Imam, Imam Hasan Askari (as) (d.260 H)

Imam Bukhari lived during the times of these four Imams yet did not take narrations from them. Imam Bukhari's esteemed book Sahih Bukhari is empty with Hadith from the Ahlulbayt Imams, even though Hadith was something of Ahlulbayt's own house house of the Prophet and there is a well known saying 'No one knows the going on inside a house than the people of that house'.

Imam Bukhari should have narrated Hadith from the Imams from the Ahlulbayt of the Prophet since they were the source of Hadith. We cannot say that Imam Bukhari did this due to hatred, rather we say that it was due to difficulties that he did not narrate from the Ahlul bayt Imams. Muhammad bin Ismaeel Bukhari (d.256 H) was alive during the Abbaside era, when he compiled Sahih Bukhari, he stated: 'In Sahih Bukhari the Hadeeth compiled are Sahih and the Sahih Hadiths that I left are much more in number'. Abdul Haleem Jundi said: 'Imam Bukhari was indicating that the Hadith that he had omitted were those in the honour of Ali and the Ahlul bayt. Imam Bukhari could not incorporate them in his Sahih Bukhari due to the occupation and hostility by Abbaside reign [Jafar al-Sadiq, p234 by al-Jundi"

Subeh Sadiq fi Fadail Imam Jafar Sadiq, pages 195-196

If Mufti's assertion is correct then we have to accept that Imam Bukhari adopted a policy of self censorship, suppressing narrations from the Ahl'ul bayt Imams (as) through fear of his rulers, in other words he was forced into adopting Taqiyyah.

41. Reply Twelve: Imam Shaybi and Imam Hasan Basri vs. Ibn Taymiyah

The learned Mufti then sites further examples of Taqiyyah on the next two pages:

It's obvious that during both the Ummayad and Abbaside Caliphates the Ahlulbayt of Prophet and their followers were subjected to injustice and harm. The one who used to have some association with Ahlulbayt or took hadeeth from them used to become a target. That is why Qadhi Shaybi (d. 104H) said:

"What have we attained from the family of Ali, if we disclose our love for them we will be killed, if we bear enmity we will go to Hell." This was the stance of the Iraqi Hadeeth scholar Shaybi, and he was a judge during the Marwani reign who was saying that those that disclosed their love for the Ahlulbayt of the Prophet, the government of the time would kill them and if you had hatred of the family of Ali then you would go to Hell for not having Iman. Whenever Imam Hasan Basri (d.110H) would narrate a ruling or saying of Ali, he never mentioned Ali's name due to the fear of Ummayad and Marwani rulers, rather he sued to say: 'Abu Zainab (Ali's title) said...' He was asked why he didn't mention Ali's name but used his title Abu Zainab when narrating the tradition to which he replied: 'I did not wish to be killed' [Imam Jafar Sadiq, p332].

Subeh Sadiq fi Fadail Imam Jafar Sadiq, pages 197-198

On the basis of the comments of Mufti Ghulam Rasul the supporters of Ibn Taymiyah need to explain why these three scholars of hadeeth were hiding the merits of the Ahl'ul bayt (as)? Was the State being run by Jews? Were the Abbasides and Ummawis Jews posing as Muslims? Certainly not, they were tyrannical Muslim rulers. State opposition to Imam Ali (as) and his descendants forced the Hadeeth scholars to hide the excellences of the Ahlulbayt (as) on account of a fear of being murdered. In other words they were practicing Taqiyyah.

42. Reply Thirteen: Abu Huraira vs. Ibn Taymiyah

We read in Sahih Bukhari Volume 1, Book 3, Number 121:

Narrated Abu Huraira:
I have memorized two kinds of knowledge from Allah's Apostle . I have propagated one of them to you and if I propagated the second, then my pharynx (throat) would be cut (i.e. killed).

Could the spiritual inheritors of Ibn Taymiyah's legacy kindly clarify explain what prevented Abu Hurarira from boldly cascading the knowledge that he acquired? What prevented him from remaining silent? Why was he fearful of being murdered? Was the prolific hadeeth narrator living amongst the kufar following the death of the Prophet (s). Of course not! On the contrary from his taking the Sahahada after the battle of khaibar up until his death, history attests to the fact that he always remained resident in the Muslim territories. Applying these comments to these facts, it becomes clear to us that he was suppressing information, due to his fear of being killed by the tyrannical regimes of the time. Such suppression is Taqiyyah in all but name. Those that deem Taqiyyah hypocrisy need to take a good long look at this testimony of Abu Hurraira contained in their most esteemed book after the Quran!

43. Reply Fourteen: Imam Shafiyee vs. Ibn Taymiyah

We see that one of the esteemed Imams of Ahle Sunnah namely Imam Shafiyee not only deemed it permissible to practice Taqiyyah before Muslims but himself practised it and this shall suffice to silence the followers of Ibn Taymiyah al-Nasibi, according to whom Taqiyyah can only be performed before the Kuffar. Towing the same line of Ibn Taymiyah, Imam Abu Hayan Andlasi and Imam Fakhruddin Razi recorded the following but made it clear that Imam Shafiyee did not believe in this innovation:

وظاهر الآية يدل على أنها مع الكفار الغالبين ، إلا أن مذهب الشافعي : أن الحالة بين المسلمين إذا شاكلت الحال بين المشركين جازت التقية محاماة عن النفس ، وهي جائزة لصون النفس والمال

"The appearance of the verse demonstrates that Taqiyyah is only permissible with the powerful disbelievers, except the madhab of Shafiyee [ra] that allows Taqiyyah (with Muslims) for self protection, in cases wherein the situation amongst the Muslims becomes similar to the situation between the Muslims and disbelievers, it is lawful for the protection of one's self and money".

Tafseer Bahar al-Muheet, Volume 3 page 191

Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 4 page 170

Now in Sawaiq al-Muhriqa we read that Imam Shafiyee used to hide his love for Ahlulbayt [as] from the Nasibi ancestors of Sipah-e-Sahaba and Ansar.org in order to remain safe from them. Imam Shafiyee expressed this in the following manner:

وما زال كتما منك حتى كأنني ... برد جواب السائلين لأعجم
وأكتم ودي مع صفاء مودتي ... لتسلم من قول الوشاة وأسلم

**"Still I hide from you...as I am unable to answer those who do questioning
I hide my love although its pure love...to avoid you and avoid myself from the statements of the denouncers"**
Sawaiq al-Muhriqa, Volume 2 page 388

44. Reply Fifteen: Imam Yahyah bin Moin (d. 233 H) practiced Taqiyyah before Muslim tyrants

The innovations introduced by Ibn Taymiyah in the belief of Taqiyyah i.e. it cannot be practiced before Muslims, can be refuted from the fact that one of the pioneer and revered Sunni Imams that resided in Baghdad namely Yahyah bin Moin (d. 233 H) not only believed in the legitimacy of practicing Taqiyyah practiced it to protect himself from the tyrants of Bani Umayah. Imam Dhahabi records:

وكان يحيى رحمه الله من أئمة السنة، فخاف من سطوة الدولة، وأجاب تقية

Yahya may Allah's mercy be upon him, was from Sunni Imams, he was scared from the oppressions of the government therefore he answered in Taqiyyah.
Siayr alam an-Nubla, Volume 11 page 87

45. Reply Sixteen: Imam Sa'dwiyah (d. 225 H) practiced Taqiyyah before Muslim rulers

Here we have an example of a reliable Sunni Imam namely Saeed bin Sulaiman al-Dhahabi popularly known as Imam Sa'dwiyah, who practiced Taqiyyah during the time of the Abbasides. Before citing it let us first reveal the lofty status enjoyed by Imam Sa'dwiyah in Ahle sunnah eyes. Imam Dhahabi called him '**Hafiz Musnad'** (Tazkirat al-Hufaz, v1 p398) and also as '**Hafiz Thabt Imam'** (Siar alam alnubala, v10 p481), while Imam Ibn Abi Hatim said: '**Thiqah, trustable'** (Al-Jarah wa al-Tadil, v4 p26), Ibn Hajar said: '**Thiqah Hafiz, from superiors of tenth generation'** (Taqrib al-Tahdib, v1 p355). Now let us quote Imam Jamaluddin Al-Mizzi who in his authority work Tahdeeb al-Kamal records:

قال أحمد بن علي وكان سعدويه من أهل السنة وامتحن فأجاب في المحنة-يعني تقية

Ahmad bin Ali said: 'Sa'dwiyah was from Ahlul Sunnah and he was examined during the affliction therefore he answered in Taqiyyah'
Tahdeeb al-Kamal, Volume 10 page 487 Translation 2291

46. Reply Seventeen: Shah Waliullah vs Ibn Taymiyah

Shaykh Muhammad Ikram in his famous book "Moj-e-Kauthar" page 63 (published by Idara Thaqafat al-Islamiyah, Lahore) notes:

On one occasion a scholar called Muhammad Fakhir Illahabadi arrived at Delhi. During a prayer at Jam'e Masjid, he recited 'Ameen' loudly. That was the first time that had happened in Dehli which the people could not bear this and when they surrounded him, he said: 'This is pointless, go and summon the biggest scholar in this city'. People took him to Hujutullah Shah Waliyullah. When the issue was asked to him, he said: 'According to Hadith, saying 'Ameen' loudly is proven'. On hearing that, the crowd began to disperse to the point that only Mualana Muhammad Fakhir and Shah Waliullah remained. Maulana Fakhir asked: 'When will you open up (reveal yourself)?'. Shah replied: 'Had I opened up, who would have saved you today?'

Comment

One can see that the Shah wouldn't offer salat openly before the people through taqiyya.

47. Reply Eighteen: Maulana Sayyid Nazeer Husayn vs Ibn Taymiyah

Shaykh Muhammad Ikram in 'Moj-e-Kauthar' has referred to Sayyid Nazeer Husayn as the Crown of the Wahabi scholars, then on page 29, he records a letter of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, wherein Sir Syed referred to Sayyid Nazeer Husayn in the following words:

"He would not perform Rafa Yadayn in Salat, but he would regard it as Sunnah-e-Huda. I said 'It is unfortunate that an act you believe to be good, yet do not practise it because of the people.' He (Maulan Nazeer Husayn) visited me, when I said this, he got up and went to the Jamia Masjid for Asr prayers, he began to read Rafa Yadayn from that time, people opposed him but the truth shall always remain the truth".

Comment

This is clear evidence that this Wahabi was also practicing Taqiyyah. It is interesting that we have a number of examples wherein the revered personalities of Ahle Sunnah practiced Taqiyyah yet these people would not admit to the legitimacy of Taqiyyah. That is why a Shia scholar Shaykh Muhammad Hasan Salahudeen in his book "Islami Tahreek Qur'an aur Sunnat ki Roshni main" [Islamic movement in the light of Quran and Sunnah] page 83 referred to such scholars as following:

"What is surprising is that some current movements are opposed to the practice of Taqiyyah on the basis of ideology, religion and history but on a practical basis they happily embrace Taqiyya."

48. Reply Nineteen: Maulana Abdul Aziz vs Ibn Taymiyah

We shall now present a modern day example of Taqiyyah practiced by one of the lovers of Ibn Taymiyyah. In 2007 the Pakistani forces in Islamabad mounted a siege of the Red Mosque to uproot Nasibi extremists that were hiding within it and co-ordintaing all manners of fitnah in and around the immediate locality in the name of Islam. As days passed, the siege became more violent through the exchange of gun fire. One of the main scholars in charge of the Madrassa sought to flee from the violence by dressing in a Burka!

The leader of a radical mosque besieged by Pakistani security forces in Islamabad has been caught trying to escape wearing a woman's burka.
Security forces seized Maulana Abdul Aziz as he tried to leave the Red Mosque amid a crowd of women...
Chaudhry Muhammad Ali, described how Abdul Aziz tried to escape wearing the all-enveloping dress worn by Muslim women.
"The maulana came out of the mosque with a group of girls wearing a burka and carrying a handbag. The girls protested when he was stopped. But officers were suspicious and after a search, Maulana Abdul Aziz was identified and arrested," he told the BBC.
Another security official told AFP that the cleric had been picked out because of his "unusual demeanour".
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/6270626.stm

Comment

In Islam it is Haram for a man to dress like a woman and vice versa, so why did Maualana Abdul Aziz do this? There can only be two options:

- **Option One:** he was either a transvestite and this was his normal attire
- **Option Two:** he was seeking to protect his life by dressing as a woman, in other words he was practicing Taqiyya

Tell us Nawasib, which option do you wish to choose? Whilst there is little background information to suggest that Maula Abdul Aziz was a closet transvestite, the safer option would be to believe that he was practicing Taqiyyah. This then causes a major headache for the Nawasib, after all Ibn Taymiyah stated one cannot practice Taqiyyah before Muslims – so how should we judge this Nasibi Mullah? This Deobandi Mullah went to the extreme length of dressing as a woman (in Taqiyyah) to save his life. Despite this we have never seen the Nawasib residing in the country criticize the Taqiyyah of Maulana Abdul Aziz. If the Deobandies have no problems with their Mullahs dressing as women in Taqiyyah, what right do they have to attack the Shi'a doctrine of Taqiyyah?

49. Reply Twenty: Ibn Taymiyah vs Ibn Taymiyah [Ibn Taymiyah himself practiced Taqiyyah before Muslims]

After giving a number of replies refuting the innovations introduced by Ibn Taymiyah on the belief of Taqiyyah viz, it cannot be practiced before Muslims and one cannot tell a lie while practicing it, let us now expose the hypocrisy of Ibn Taymiyah himself.

The background of the incident is that Ibn Taymiah was incarcerated by a Sunni judge on account of his absurd beliefs. The Sunni scholars decided to talk to him and determine whether ot not he had changed his mind. Faced with this questioning, Ibn Taymiah who was Hanbali practiced Taqqiyah and pretended to be Shafiyee and Ashari before the concerned people to get released. Imam Ibn Hajar Asqalani records:

ثم اجتمعوا في ثاني عشرة وقرروا الصفي الهندي يبحث معه ثم أخروه وقدموا الكمال الزملكاني ثم انفصل الأمر على أنه شهد على نفسه أنه شافعي المعتقد

They gathered in the 12th and decided to choose Safi al-Hindi to debate him (Ibn Taymiyah), but then they sent Kamal al-Zamalekani. Therefore he (Ibn Taymiyah) claimed to be a Shafiyee.
Al-Durar al-Kamina, Volume 1 page 46

We all know that Ibn Taymiyah was a Hanbali but he found himself in an adverse situation, he practiced Taqqiyah and decalred himself to be a Shafiyee. We also read that he once declared himself to be Ash'ari:

ولم يزل ابن تيمية في الجب إلى أن شفع فيه مهنا أمير آل فضل فأخرج في ربيع الأول في الثالث وعشرين منه وأحضر إلى القلعة ووقع البحث مع بعض الفقهاء فكتب عليه محضر بأنه قال أنا أشعري

Ibn Taymiyah remained in the jail till the prince Mehana al-Fadel intercede for him. In the 23th of Rabee al-Awal he (Ibn Taymiyah) was brought to the fort and debated with some scholars then they wrote a report that he (Ibn Taymiyah) admitted to be Ash'ari.
Al-Durar al-Kamina, Volume 1 page 47

The fact that Ibn Taymiyah practiced Taqiyyah before Muslims and lied proves that his actual motive behind issuing such a Fatwa was to misguide Muslims and create unnecessary tensions amongst th

6. Chapter Six: Innovations in Taqiyyah introduced by Mufti Khalid Mahmood

As we stated earlier, when the legitimacy of practicing Taqiyyah was proven before the Nawasib from the Quran and Sunnah, the Nawasib then had no other choice but to devise innovations on Taqqiyah due to their hatred for the Shias of Ahlulbayt [as]. In the last chapter, we mentioned and refuted the innovations by Ibn Taymiyah. Unfortunately, the Nasibi Fitna yet again resurrected itself, equipped with several 'different' innovations and the final mutation has come from the mouth of Mufti Khalid Mahmood from Sipah Sahaba (Deoband). His approach was to compile all of these innovations. His book has been published online at the Sipah Sahaba's web site *kr-hcy.com*. It is based on an alleged debate with a Shi'a scholar. During the debate, he developed the following innovations and claims:

- *Taqiyyah is only allowed for ordinary members of the Muslim Ummah. It cannot be practiced by people appointed by Allah (swt) e.g. Prophets and Messengers. [He wanted to prove that Taqiyyah was Haram for Maula Ali [as], as according to Shi'a aqeedah, he [as] was appointed by Allah (swt)]*
- *Even in the case of ordinary Muslims, Allah [swt] has only given the 'permission' to practice Taqiyyah, and that this cannot be construed as an 'order'. He claims that those, who practice Taqiyyah, possess a lower level of iman.[While in the Madhab of the Ahle Bayt, it is compulsory to do Taqiyyah in order to protect the interests of the community and Islam].*
- *Not a single Prophet/Imam (including Holy Prophet [s]) ever practiced Taqiyyah. [While it's a matter of history and according to Madhab of Ahlulbayt, Rasul Allah (s) and Maula Ali (as) and other Imams (as) themselves practiced Taqiyyah].*

All these innovations are recorded in Mufti Khalid Mahmood's book that cites the alleged 'debate' between Mufti Khalid Mahmood (of Sipah Sahaba in Cape Town, South Africa) and a Shia scholar whom Khalid calls 'Hussaini Sahib' . We don't have any resources to authenticate this alleged debate, but doubt it ever occurred. Sipah Sahaba's website has claimed that the Shi'a debater namely 'Hussaini Sahib' was an Ayatullah, yet during the alleged debate we see that 'Hussaini Sahib' was unaware of the simple fact the the book Tahdib ul Ahkam is among Kutb Arba'a (i.e. the four books of Ahadith, that are most famous amongst Shi'as).

The innovations and 'historical facts' that Mufti claimed during this debate are fascinating. Mufti Khalid collated the various innovations that had already been introduced by Nawasib in previous centuries. So, let's begin with Allah's help.

50. What is actual Shi'a doctrine of Taqiyyah?

During the debate, Mufti Khalid made a lot of false accusations about the Shi'a view of Taqiyyah. He didn't even know what' the actual Shi'a doctrine of Taqiyyah was. In fact, for centuries, Nawasib have made it their mission to disseminate false propaganda against the Shi'a of Maula Ali bin Abi Talib [as], namely they deem Taqiyya deception and lying before others.

So, it is necessary at this point that we offer our actual point of view about Taqiyyah which is in line with all the Ahadith. People can only criticize our position when they know what our position is, not the position that is presented by the followers of Mu'awiyah. For us, Taqiyyah means "diplomacy" i.e. taking different steps according to the different situations, and we must be sure that these steps are the best in order to save the interest of the community and Islam. Shaykh Muhammad Ridha al-Mudhaffar in his book, "Aqa'id al-Imamiyah," wrote that:

Rules of Taqiyyah
Taqiyya should conform to specific rules vis-a-vis the situation wherein eminent danger is present; these rules, listed in many books of Fiqh (Jurisprudence), along with the severity of

the danger determine the validity, or lack of, al-Taqiyya itself.

Taqiyyah should be abandoned in certain Conditions
It is not mandatory to practice it (al-Taqiyya) at all times; on the contrary, it is permissible, and sometimes necessary, to abandon it (al-Taqiyya) altogether; as in the case where revealing the truth will further the cause of the religion, and provide a direct service to Islam; and (when the revealing of the truth is such that it constitutes) a jihad (striving) for (Islam's) sake; (verily,) in such a situation, wealth and life should be forsaken.

Abandoning Taqiyyah becomes obligatory, when innocent people are killed
Furthermore, Taqiyya is prohibited in instances wherein the killing of innocent people and the spread of corruption will result; and in cases wherein the marring of the religion will result, and/or a significant harm will befall the Muslims, either by leading them astray or corrupting and oppressing them.

Abandoning Taqiyyah becomes obligatory when one can spread the message of Islam
Either way, al-Taqiyya, as the Shi'a uphold it, does not make of the Shi'a a secret cooperative that seeks to destroy and corrupt, as the enemies (of the Shi'a) wish to present them; (these critics launch their verbal attacks) without really heeding the subject (of Taqiyya); and (without even) laboring to understand our own opinion on the matter (of al-Taqiyya). Nor does it (al-Taqiyya) mandate that the religion and its injunctions become a secret of secrets that cannot be disclosed to those who do not subscribe to its teachings.

How so, when the books of the Imamiyah (the Shi'a) that deal with the (subjects of) Fiqh, Kalam, and beliefs are in abundant supply, and have exceeded the limits (of publications) expected from any nation professing its beliefs."

Now, if the Shi'a Aqida of Taqiyyah is clear, we can move to Mufti's innovations.

51. Mufti Khalid's claim that Taqiyyah is Haram for divinely appointed people (prophets and Imams)

Mufti Khalid's states that there are two types of people:

1. 'Steadfast people', who are directly appointed by Allah like prophets. And Allah has made it Haram upon them to practice Taqiyyah.
2. 'Permitted people, which are ordinary people and Allah gave permission to these people to practice Taqiyyah in need.
   For the above division, Mufti Khalid presented the following verse of Quran as proof:

الَّذِينَ يُبَلِّغُونَ رِسَالَاتِ اللَّهِ وَيَخْشَوْنَهُ وَلَا يَخْشَوْنَ أَحَدًا إِلَّا اللَّهَ وَكَفَى بِاللَّهِ حَسِيبًا

[Yusufali 33:39] (It is the practice of those) who preach the Messages of Allah, and fear Him, and fear none but Allah.

He claimed that since Prophets and Imams have no fear that's why they don't practice Taqiyyah. Please see the following image from his book "Taqiyyah Na Kijiye" (Don't practice Taqiyyah).
Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 23
Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 24

[Note: From the above division of people into two groups, Mufti Khalid wants to criticize Maula Ali (as) and our other Imams of Ahlulbayt (as) querying how they practiced Taqiyyah if they were really appointed by Allah (swt)]

But there are so many flaws in Mufti Khalid's claim. Let's examine them one by one.

52. Maula Ali (as) vs. ‘Fear of life’

The literal minds of the pathetic Nawasib never understood the Islamic concept of Taqiyyah. They understand only one thing, that Shi'a practice Taqiyyah on account of fear of their lives. But there is a whole philosophy behind this, which Nawasib can never discover due to their disease of literalism. There is a huge difference between the following two cases:

1. Fearing ones life, when one loves this world. Such a person literally fears every tyrant, who can take away his life.
2. Fearing ones life, for the sake of Allah. That means to save ones life, rather than foolishly giving it away since this brings no benefit to Islam. Such a person only fears Allah in the real sense and is not afraid of tyrant Kings/Rulers.

We believe that Maula Ali (as) never practiced Taqiyyah due to a fear of Umar Ibn Khattab or all those who fled battlefields. No, certainly not. But he practiced Taqiyyah, when it was not in the interest of Islam to start fighting to get his 'right' back. (We will discuss this it in detail in next chapter. Insha-Allah).

53. Not a single ‘Momin’ is allowed to have a ‘fear of life’ in the literal sense

Similarly, our belief is this that not even a single believer (Momin) is allowed to practice Taqiyyah due to fear of his life in literal sense. It is Haram. i.e. we practice Taqiyyah, when our lives are in danger, while we believe that our lives are "Ammanah" of Allah (swt), who doesn't want us to foolishly lose our lives. It is like SUICIDE, which is Haram. But Allah (swt) orders us that in situations, where giving away one's life serves no benefit to Islam and endangers a Muslim's life and property, then it's obligatory to hide the truth or to a lie and in this regard, the story of the people of Kahf which we mentioned earlier best proves this.

And this was the practice and order of Rasul Allah (s) and as well as of other Prophets.

54. Musa (as) also feared for his life for the sake of Allah's religion

If Nasabis still deny it and abuse us for fearing for our lives, then we shall show them the example of Hadhrat Musa (as) from the Quran. It's the same type of fear of life that Hadhrat Musa (as) felt against the Magicians of Firoon. Quran says:

قَالَ بَلْ أَلْقُوا فَإِذَا حِبَالُهُمْ وَعِصِيُّهُمْ يُخَيَّلُ إِلَيْهِ مِن سِحْرِهِمْ أَنَّهَا تَسْعَى
فَأَوْجَسَ فِي نَفْسِهِ خِيفَةً مُّوسَى
قُلْنَا لَا تَخَفْ إِنَّكَ أَنتَ الْأَعْلَى

[Yusufali 20:66-68] He said, "Nay, throw ye first!" Then behold their ropes and their rods-so it seemed to him on account of their magic - began to be in lively motion! So Moses conceived in his mind a (sort of) fear. We said: "Fear not! for thou hast indeed the upper hand.

Now prophet Musa (as)’s fear was not because of their magic which could have cost his beloved life, but it was because he feared that his death would bring a great loss to the interests of Allah's religion. Unfortunately, the literal minds of Nawasib are unable to understand the differences between literal and figurative expressions. We will make this point more clear later on. But at this moment, we want to ask Mufti Khalid and his Nasibi followers belonging to Sipah Sahabah, the following questions:

Do you really want to take above statement in a 'literal sense' and conclude that Musa (as) really stepped back for the fear of his beloved life?

1. If your answer is 'Yes', then how can you defend your claim that no Prophet of Allah has ever feared anything else other than Allah and that's why Taqiyyah was Haram upon them?
2. And if you say that Musa (as) stepped back only in order to save the interest of Islam, then how can you still criticize the Shias of Ahlulbayt [as] who also do the same for the sake of religion's interests?
   Mufti Sahib cannot play double standards i.e. to make something Halal in Sharia for Prophets, but Haram for Shias of Ahlulbayt [as] when they practice the same thing.

Now let's turn towards some critique of Mufti Khalid's claim.

55. First Critique

The above interpretation advanced by Mufti Khalid by dividing the believers (Momineen) into two groups is pure conjecture. Our Holy Prophet [s] never understood the above verse in this way and never divided the people into such categories. If Mufti Khalid is true in his claim, then he or his Nasibi adherents must show us any such tradition from the Holy Prophet [s]. In fact, the Shi'a Alim throughout the alleged debate demanded such a tradition, but Mufti Khalid was unable to present it.

56. Second Critique

We would like to ask Sipah Sahaba:

Why did Mufti Khalid take only one part of Quran (which suits to his ideas), and neglect/conceal other part of that Quran go against his conjecture?

Let us present the other verses of the Quran that Mufti Khalid has tactically neglected. Allah (swt) says in the Quran that not only prophets, but also the "Awliya Allah" have no fear.

أَلا إِنَّ أَوْلِيَاء اللّهِ لاَ خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلاَ هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ

[Pickthal 10:62] Lo! verily the friends of Allah are (those) on whom fear (cometh) not, nor do they grieve?

Can Mufti Khalid tell us why he neglected this Quranic verse and failed to include the Awliya Allah among the 'steadfast people'?

[Note: Mufti Khalid later claims that Ammar Yasir (r) practiced Taqiyyah, because he was an ordinary person and did not come within the remit of "steadfast people". But the verse of the Quran is clear that Awliya Allah also have no fear]

The motive behind the Nasibi's selective application of the verse

It is due to the reason that one such alleged 'Wali Allah' of Nawasib was weeping for the fear of his life in the cave of Thawr. Need we to tell you more about this alleged Wali Allah? It's the same alleged Wali Allah who fled from the battle field of Uhud along with many more such alleged 'Awliya Allah' and Allah revealed the following verse:

إِذْ تُصْعِدُونَ وَلاَ تَلْوُونَ عَلَى أحَدٍ وَالرَّسُولُ يَدْعُوكُمْ فِي أُخْرَاكُمْ فَأَثَابَكُمْ غُمَّاً بِغَمٍّ لِّكَيْلاَ تَحْزَنُواْ عَلَى مَا فَاتَكُم وَلاَ مَا أَصَابَكُمْ وَاللّهُ خَبِيرٌ بِمَا تَعْمَلُون

[Yusufali 3:153] Behold! ye were climbing up the high ground, without even casting

a side glance at any one, and the Messenger in your rear was calling you back.

The texts of history testify that in Uhud the vast bulk of the Sahaba fled the battlefield leaving Holy Prophet [s] wounded. Umar was of those that abandoned Holy Prophet [s] and sat dejected declaring that there was no need to fight as Holy Prophet [s] was dead. See:
1. Siratun Nabi, by Allamah Shibli Numani, English translation by M.Tayyib Bakhsh Budayuni, Volume 2 page 66-67 (Kazi Publications, Lahore - First edition)
2. The History of al Tabari, Volume 6 page 122 - English translation by M.V.MacDonald (State University of New York Press)

Similarly 'Uthman fled so far that Rasul (s) mocked him stating **'the distance you fled was far'.** He returned to Rasul (s) after three days (The History of al Tabari, Volume 6 page 127).

Although Allah forgave the people for fleeing from Uhud, nevertheless He took a promise from people that they will never flee again from battlefield and never let Rasul (s) alone there.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُواْ إِذَا لَقِيتُمُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُواْ زَحْفاً فَلاَ تُوَلُّوهُمُ الأَدْبَارَ
وَمَن يُوَلِّهِمْ يَوْمَئِذٍ دُبُرَهُ إِلاَّ مُتَحَرِّفاً لِّقِتَالٍ أَوْ مُتَحَيِّزاً إِلَى فِئَةٍ فَقَدْ بَاء بِغَضَبٍ مِّنَ اللّهِ وَمَأْوَاهُ جَهَنَّمُ وَبِئْسَ الْمَصِيرُ

[Yusufali 8:15-16] O ye who believe! when ye meet the Unbelievers in hostile array, never turn your backs to them. If any do turn his back to them on such a day - unless it be in a stratagem of war, or to retreat to a troop (of his own)- he draws on himself the wrath of Allah, and his abode is Hell,- an evil refuge (indeed)!

But what happened? Did these alleged Awliya Allah keep their promise? No, they again fled away for the fear of their lives at Hunain (in 9th Hijri), leaving Rasul (s) again alone.

لَقَدْ نَصَرَكُمُ اللّهُ فِي مَوَاطِنَ كَثِيرَةٍ وَيَوْمَ حُنَيْنٍ إِذْ أَعْجَبَتْكُمْ كَثْرَتُكُمْ فَلَمْ تُغْنِ عَنكُمْ شَيْئًا وَضَاقَتْ عَلَيْكُمُ الأَرْضُ
بِمَا رَحُبَتْ ثُمَّ وَلَّيْتُم مُّدْبِرِين

[Yusufali 9:25] Assuredly Allah did help you in many battle-fields and on the day of Hunain: Behold! your great numbers elated you, but they availed you naught: the land, for all that it is wide, did constrain you, and ye turned back in retreat.

The books of Ahle Sunnah clearly state that in the battle of Hunayn, in which ten thousand companions (including all those who had done bay'ah under the tree) had participated, all of them fled away except four who remained steadfast, three of them were from the Prophet's clan, Banu Hashim ('Ali ibn Abi Talib, 'Abbas ibn 'Abdul Muttalib and Abu Sufyan ibn al Harith ibn 'Abdul Muttalib) and one from another clan ('Abdullah ibn Mas'ud)."
Tarikh al Khamis, vol 2. p. 113 As Sirah al Halabiyah. vol. 3. p 255

Let's also see the testimony of Abu Qatada about Hunain, which is noted by Imam Bukhari in his Sahih:

Narrated Abu Qatada:

We set out in the company of Allah's Apostle on the day (of the battle) of Hunain. When we faced the enemy, the Muslims retreated and I saw a pagan throwing himself over a Muslim. I turned around and came upon him from behind and hit him on the shoulder with the sword He (i.e. the pagan) came towards me and seized me so violently that I felt as if it were death itself, but death overtook him and he released me. I followed 'Umar bin Al Khattab and asked (him), "What is wrong with the people (fleeing)?" He replied, "This is the Will of Allah,"
Sahih Bukhari Volume 4, Book 53, Number 370

For the centuries we are asking Nawasib to tell us if their Hero Umar Ibn Khattab received a revelation from Allah (swt) for his statement **[i.e. It is the order of Allah.'].** And up till now Nawasib haven't replied us that from where Umar came to know the order of Allah for fleeing.

Indeed, such fear of your lives and saving them by running from battlefields never came under the definition of Taqiyyah by Maula Ali (as). By Allah, the Taqiyyah of Maula Ali (as) never included this fleeing from battlefields, on account of fear of his life. But our Maula was one, who claimed that he didn't fear if 'death' attacks him, or he attacks 'death'.

57. Third Critique

Can Mufti Khalid tell us why he neglected the following verse and excluded the Momineen from group of 'steadfast people'?

وَأَنَّا لَمَّا سَمِعْنَا الْهُدَى آمَنَّا بِهِ فَمَن يُؤْمِن بِرَبِّهِ فَلَا يَخَافُ بَخْسًا وَلَا رَهَقًا

[Yusufali 72:13] 'And as for us, since we have listened to the Guidance, we have accepted it: and any who believes in his Lord has no fear, either of a short (account) or of any injustice.

In fact, the hero personalities of Nawasib ran so many times from battlefields that they had to deny the above clear verse of Quran and to say that one can still be a Momin if one is coward and fears for his life.

Need we to comment any more?

58. Did any Prophet ever practice Taqiyyah?

On page 49 of this book, Mufti Khalid Mahmood challenges Shi'a to show him if any other Prophet ever practiced Taqiyyah.
Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 49

It is very strange that the Nasibi is rejecting the notion that Rasul Allah (s) or other prophets practised Taqiyyah, while it is reported in Bukhari, Muslim and each and every Sunni book on the life of Prophet Muhammad (s), that Rasul Allah (s) practiced Taqiyyah. In fact, Islam started via the practice of Taqiyyah.

So, on the request of Mufti Khalid, we are notifying him and all other Nasabis when our Rasul (s) and other prophets practised Taqiyyah.

59. Reply One - Prophet Muhammad (s) practiced Taqiyyah during the first three years of his mission and he preached secretly

This is a fact that can be found in all and all the classical works of Ahle Sunnah/Shi'a or non Muslim Scholars. For example, Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti records:

Ibn Abbas said: 'The messenger of Allah (pbuh) remained concealed for years, showed nothing of what Allah revealed on Him, till Allah revealed {Therefore declare openly what you are bidden}which means show your matter in Makka because Allah perished those who mock at you and mock at Quran, and they were five persons.
Tafseer Dur al-Manthur, Volume 5 page 100 Surah 15 Verse 94

Although the revelations had already begun onto Holy Prophet [s] but concerns from certain people made him to remain conceal for few years. If that was not Taqqiyah then what was it?

60. Reply Two - Rasulullah (s) practiced Taqiyya before the newly converted Sahaba

We read in Sahih al Bukhari, Book of Knowledge Volume 1, Book 3, Number 128:
Narrated Aswad:

Ibn Az-Zubair said to me, "Aisha used to tell you secretly a number of things. What did she tell you about the Ka'ba?" I replied, "She told me that once the Prophet said, 'O 'Aisha! Had not your people been still close to the pre-Islamic period of ignorance (infidelity)! I would have dismantled the Ka'ba and would have made two doors in it; one for entrance and the other for exit." Later on Ibn Az-Zubair did the same.

Comment

Was it incumbent on Rasulullah (s) to redesign the Ka'aba, yes or no? If it was not then why did Rasulullah (s) say **"Had not your people been still close to the pre-Islamic period of ignorance (infidelity)! I would have dismantled the Ka'ba and would have made two doors in it".** If it was compulsory then why did Rasulullah (s) fail to carry out this religious duty on account of his fear of the reaction by the newly converted Sahaba? If this silence is not proof of taqiyya then what is?

In his commentary of the above hadith (destruction of the Ka'aba) Allamah Badrudeen A'ini in his commentary of Sahih Bukhari Umdatul Qari, Volume 2 page 204, makes an interesting comment:

قال ابن بطال فيه أنه قد يترك يسير من الأمر بالمعروف إذا خشي منه أن يكون سببا لفتنة قوم ينكرونه

Ibn Batal said: It is possible to abandon 'enjoining the good' if there is a fear of fitna from the people who would deny it.

In other words this Sunni scholar is saying that one can practice Taqiyya / remain silent on an order, if such an order incites Fitnah. The tradition in Sahih Bukhari clearly demonstrates that Rasulullah (s) preferred practicing taqiyya to implementing an act that would cause opposition from the Sahaba.

61. Reply Three - Nasibi themselves claim that Ibrahim (as) practiced Taqiyyah and told a lie

It is interesting that Nasabis themselves have been claiming since centuries that Hadhrat Ibrahim (as) practiced Taqiyyah and told a lie several times. Let us quote from Nasibi beloved Tafsir of Ibn Kathir:

How Ibrahim broke the Idols
Then Ibrahim swore an oath, which some of his people heard, to plot against their idols, i.e., to break them and destroy them after they had gone away and turned their backs, when they went out to their festival. They had a festival which they would go out to celebrate. Abu Ishaq reported from Abu Al-Ahwas from `Abdullah [Ibn Mas`ud], "When the people of Ibrahim went out to celebrate their festival, they passed by him and said, `O Ibrahim, are you not coming out with us' <u>He said, `I am sick.' [While he was not actually sick]'</u> It was only the day before that he had said,

(And by Allah, I shall plot a plan for your idols after you have gone away and turned your backs.) and some of the people had heard him.

(So he broke them to pieces,) means, he smashed them all, except for the biggest idol. This is like the Ayah,

(Then he turned upon them, striking (them) with (his) right hand) [37:93].

(that they might turn to it.) It was said that he put a hammer in the hands of the biggest idol so that the people would think that it had become jealous on its own account and objected to these smaller idols being worshipped alongside it, so it had broken them.

(They said: "Who has done this to our gods He must indeed be one of the wrongdoers.") When they came back and saw what Ibrahim had done to their idols, humiliating them and lowering their status, proving that they were not divine and that those who worshipped them were fools,

(They said: "Who has done this to our gods He must indeed be one of the wrongdoers.") because of this action of his.

(They said: "We heard a young man talking against them, who is called Ibrahim.") Those who had heard him swearing to plot against them said, we heard a young man talking about them, and they said that he was called Ibrahim.

(They said: "Then bring him before the eyes of the people...") meaning, in front of a large audience so that all the people could be present. This was Ibrahim's ultimate purpose, so that he could tell this great gathering about the extent of their ignorance and how foolish they were to worship idols which could not defend themselves from harm or help themselves, so how could they ask them for help

(They said: "Are you the one who has done this to our gods, O Ibrahim" He said: "Nay, this one, the biggest of them did it...") referring to the one he had left alone and had not broken.
Tafseer of Ibn Kathir

We hope that Mufti Sahib is now able to see when Prophets practiced Taqiyyah. We invite him to exclude Ibrahim (as) also from the list of "steadfast people" as he did in the case of Ammar Yasir (ra.). Let's see if Mufti Sahib takes this challenge or not. Moreover, let us remind our readers about the Fatwa (Bida'a) of Ibn Taymiyah, where he claimed that in Taqiyyah one can remain silent but cannot tell a lie. It's a challenge to supporters of Ibn Taymiyah to try to apply his Fatwa against Hadhrat Ibrahim (as), if they are indeed "truthful".

62. Nawasib even deem it permissible to send their wives to other tyrants, when they fear for their their lives

On the one hand, Mufti Sahib claims that Prophets (as) feared none except Allah (swt) and they never practiced Taqiyyah and on the other hand, the beloved hero of Mufti Sahib, Abu Huraira, claims that prophets feared so much of their lives that they even used to declare their own 'wives' as 'sisters' so as to save their lives. Even worse, the beloved narrator of Nawasib is claiming that prophets of Allah [swt] even used to send their 'wives' to tyrant Kings, fearing for their lives. (Naudobillah). The following Nasibi tradition is reported by Abu Huraira, and is authenticated by both Hadith Masters, Imam Bukhari and Imam Muslim.

Abu Huraira reported Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) as saying Prophet Ibrahim (peace be upon him) never told a lie but only thrice: two times for the sake of Allah (for example, his words):" I am sick," and his words:" But it was the big one amongst them which has done that" and because of Sara (his wife). He had come in a land inhabited by haughty and cruel men along with Sara. She was very good-

looking amongst the people, so he said to her: If these were to know that you are my wife they would snatch you away from me, so if they ask you tell that you are my sister and in fact you are my sister in Islam, and I do not know of any other Muslim in this land besides I and you. And when they entered that land the tyrants came to see her and said to him (the king): 'there comes to your land a woman, whom you alone deserve to possess, so he (the kings sent someone (towards her) and she was brought and Ibrahim (peace be upon him) stood in preyer, and when she visited him (the tyrant king came) he could help but stretch his hand towards her and his hand was tied up. He said: Supplicate Allah so that He may release my hand and I will do no harm to you. She did that and the man repeated (the same highhandedness) and his hand was again tied up more tightly than on the first occasion and he said to her like that and she again did that (supplicated), but he repeated (the same highhandedness and his hands were tied up more tightly than on the previous occasion). He then again said: Supplicate your Lord so that He may set my hand free; by. Allah I shall do no harm to you. She did and his hand was freed. Then he called the person who had brought her and said to him: You have brought to me the satan and you have not brought to me a human being, so turn them out from my land, and he gave Hajira as a gift to her. She returned (along with Hajira) and when Ibrahim (peace be upon him) saw her, he said: How have you returned? She said: With full safety (have I returned). Allah held the hand of that debauch and he gave me a maid-servant. Abu Huraira said: O sons of the rain of the sky, she is your mother.
Sahih Muslim, Book 030, Number 5848

Tehrif in Sahih Bukhari

Now let us see the English translation of same above Hadith from Sahih Bukhari, which is done by Saudi paid scholar Mohsin Khan.

Narrated Abu Huraira:
The Prophet said: Abraham did not tell lies except three. (One of them was) when Abraham passed by a tyrant and (his wife) Sara was accompanying him (Abu Huraira then mentioned the whole narration and said:) (The tyrant) gave her Hajar. Sara said, "Allah saved me from the hands of the Kafir (i.e. infidel) and gave me Hajar to serve me." (Abu Huraira added:) That (Hajar) is your mother, O Banu Ma'-As-Sama' (i.e., the Arabs).
Sahih Bukhari, Volume 7, Book 62, Number 21

Need we to comment any more on this Tehrif?

63. Reply Four – Prophet Musa [as] practiced Taqiyyah for a number of years

We read in the Holy Quran that Firon accused Musa [as] for being amongst the Kafireen (disbelievers) yet Musa [as] did not negate it and the Sunni scholars have commented that it was not the case since Musa [as] had been leading life among them in Taqiyyah. We read in Quran:

[Shakir 26:18-19] (Firon) said: Did we not bring you up as a child among us, and you tarried among us for (many) years of your life? And you did (that) deed of yours which you did, and you are one of the ungrateful.

Most relevantly, Imam Fakhruddin Razi states:

وقد افترى عليه أو جهل أمره لأنه كان (يعاشرهم) بالتقية فإن الكفر غير جائز على الأنبياء قبل النبوة

He (Firon) slandered or misunderstood His [as] matter, because he [as] was living amongst them under Taqiyyah, surely kufr is not possible to be committed by prophets.
Tafseer Kabeer, Volume 11 page 467

Imam Nafasi records:

وهذا افتراء منه عليه لأنه معصوم من الكفر وكان يعايشـهم بالتقية

"This was a slander, because He [as] is infallible from Kufr, He was living with them under Taqiyyah"
Tafseer Nafsi, Volume 3 page 182

We read in Tafseer Baydhawi that Firon accused Musa [as] of being one of the disbelievers because:

فإنه عليه الصلاة والسـلام كان يعايشـهم بالتقية

"He [as] was living with them under Taqiyyah"
Tafseer Baydhawi, Volume 1 page 234

Also see:

Tafseer Gharaib al Quran, Volume 6 page 76
Tafseer Kashaf, Volume 1 page 877

64. Reply Five – The Ahle Sunnah Ulema have acknowledged a that fear of tyranny entitles prophets to indulge in Kufr (i.e. practice Taqiyya)

We read in Sharh Aqaid Nafsi, page 98 wherein Allamah Sa'dudeen Taftazani wrote a commentary of the Aqaid of Najeemudeen Umar bin Muhammad Nafsi, in his discussion on the perfection of prophets, he states:

"It's prohibited to attribute minor and great sins to prophets, it is permitted for prophets to recite kufr in a state of Taqiyya".

In his commentary of the comments of Nafsi, page 43, Taftazani states:

"Some have disallowed [the notion] that Prophets can practice taqiyya, Faadhil Khyaal asked [rhetorically] how can such individuals practice taqiyya when they have to remove fear? In some circumstances this is the order of Allah (swt)".

We have cited the opinion of the Shamsudeen Ahmed bin Musa Khyaal that it is permissible for Prophets to indulge in open kufr in a state of Taqiyya.

65. Reply Six - According to Ahle Sunnah Prophet Ibrahim (as) recited Kufr in a state of Taqiyyah

When at night Ibrahim [as] saw the stars and said: **'This is my lord'** (6:76), Imam Fakhruddin Razi under its commentary records:

"He peace be upon him was ordered to do Dawah for Allah, his status was of one who is forced to say kufr and it is known that when someone is forced it is permissible to say kufr, Allah almighty said *'{not he who is compelled while his*

***heart is at rest on account of faith}'* if it is permissible to say kufr for saving one person, surely it is worthier to say kufr to save a group of rational people".**

[Tafseer Kabeer, volume 6 page 347]

66. Reply Seven – According to Ahle Sunnah a Prophet can commit kufr (in a state of Taqiyya) by prostrating to other than Allah under duress

Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti records in Tafseer Durre Manthur, Volume 6 page 402:

When the Coptic informed that Musa killed a man, Pharaoh issued an order: 'Find Musa and kill him as he has murdered one of our people'. The people who were searching for Musa said: 'Let us search for him in the streets because Musa is not good at recognizing the streets.' When Musa was in the street a man came and told Musa- '*The Chiefs are taking counsel together about thee, to slay thee: so get thee away, for I do give thee sincere advice...He therefore got away therefrom, looking about, in a state of fear. He prayed O my Lord! save me from people given to wrong-doing.'* When he was in the streets. An angel came to him riding on a horse with a spear. When Musa saw him, He came forward and prostrated to him. The (angel) said: 'Do not prostrate to me, but follow me'. Hence, he followed him and he directed him to Midian.

[Tafseer Durre Manthur, Volume 6 page 402 Surah 28 Verses 20-21]

67. Why did Ammar Yasir Taqiyyah and not his parents?

[Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 23]
[Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 24]
[Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 25]

In these pages, Nasibi Mufti claims that Ammar Yasir possessed a lower level of Iman in comparison to his parents, because he practiced taqiyyah whilst his parents didn't and became the first Shaheed (martyrs) of Islam. During the debate, he has repeated this question, *"If Taqiyyah becomes obligatory during times of need, then why didn't Ammar Yasir's parents practice it?"*

68. Reply

What can we say about the level of intelligence of Nawasib! At that point of time the Quran was being revealed and there was no explicit order present in Quran as what to do in such situation. Hence the people had no divine law informing them of how to respond to such a scenario. Ammar Yasir (ra) was the first individual that said bad words under duress in an adverse situation, and subsequently approached the Holy Prophet [s] to ascertain the Islamic ruling (Hukm) for such situations to which Rasul (s) ordered him to do the same if he was confronted with the same situation again. It was only *after this,* that the Quranic verse was revealed, permitting the practice of Taqiyyah under duress.

Mufti Sahib once again adopted conjecture and claimed that action of Ammar's parents was better and they were amongst the "steadfast people", whilst Ammar (ra) was less fearful of Allah and hence had a lower level of iman.

It is indeed unfortunate that these nefarious Nawasib are prepared to insult a prominent Sahabi of Rasulullah (s), to attain the objective of defaming the Shias of Ahlulbayt [as]. One can only imagine the number of fatwas that would have rebounded against us had we suggested that their their Imams such as Mu'awiya had a lower level of Iman. Worthy of note is the complete lack of Qur'anic / Hadith evidence to back his attack on Ammar's faith. The simplest means to

attack such false Qiyas is to cite the words of Rasulullah (s) on the Iman of Ammar. We read this hadith in Sunan ibn Majah Volume 1 page 82, Chapter on the Excellences of Ammar ibn Yasir as narrated by Ibn Hani:

Ammar has been brimmed with Eman (faith) up to the uppermost of bones (i.e. elbows, shoulders and ankles).

Rasulullah (s) graded the Iman of Ammar to be of such a high level it covers every part of his anatomy i.e. it is complete, and yet this Nasabi Mullah has sought to grade Ammar's Iman as that of a low level. Whose words should we give greater credence to Rasul Allah (s) or to this Nasibi Mullah?

69. Did Rasul Allah (s) discourage Taqiyyah [Permission vs. Order]?

Nawasib enjoy introducing new things into Islamic Sharia so provide the opportunity to produce false allegations against the Shi'a of Ahlulbayt [as]. Take the example of Mufti Khalid Mahmood's who asserts that:

- whilst Rasul Allah (s) 'permitted' Taqiyyah, he never 'ordered' it and always discouraged it.
- even in scenarios when Taqiyyah is 'permitted' one that abstains from it, becomes amongst the 'steadfast people' and attains greater rewards. He suggests that the parents of Ammar Yasir attained greater 'rewards' than him because Ammar practiced Taqiyyah whilst they did not.

70. Our Reply

This is a blatant Bida'a (innovation), introduced excusively by Mufti Khalid Mahmood, with the absence of any saying wherein Prophet Muhammad [s] discouraged people from practising Taqiyyah during times of need. In Madhab of the Ahl'ulbayt [as], there there are different situations for Taqiyyah:

- A situation, when it becomes 'obligatory to practice' Taqiyyah.
- A situation, in which it becomes 'obligatory to abandon' Taqiyyah

An example of the first type of situation has been described by Imam al-Ghazzali in his book popular book "Ihya Uloom al-Din":

أن عصمة دم المسلم واجبة. فمهما كان في الصدق سفك دم امرئ مسلم قد اختفى من ظالم فالكذب فيه واجب

Safeguarding of a Muslim's life is a mandatory obligation that should be observed; and that LYING is permissible when the shedding of a Muslim's blood is at stake.
Ihya Uloom al-Din, Volume 2 page 332

Similarly, Ammar Yasir [ra] approached the Holy Prophet [s], to know of the Islamic ruling for one's actions in such situations, to which the Holy Prophet [s] 'ordered' him to do the same again (i.e. to practice Taqiyyah and even use abusive language towards the Prophet [s] and Allah, if he is forced to do so).

If abstaining from Taqiyyah in such a situation was a 'more virtouous act' then the Holy Prophet [s]would have made it clear to Ammar [ra] that the stance adopted by his parents was more virtuous. The reality is he (s) did not rather than discouraging him from practising Taqiyyah, he encouraged and ordered him to do it again if was exposed to a similar situation.

71. Another incident of Taqiyyah

Similarly, a Sahabi Hajaj Ibn 'Aalat sought to take his wealth from Makka, by directing abusive language towards Rasul Allah (s). Sunni scholars have records the incident in this manner:

After the conquest of the city of Khaybar by the Muslims, the Prophet (s) was approached by Hajaj Ibn `Aalat and told: "O Prophet of Allah: I have in Makka some excess wealth and some relatives, and I would like to have them back; am I excused if I bad-mouth you (to escape persecution)?" The Prophet (s) excused him and said: "Say whatever you have to say."

1. al-Sirah al-Halabiyyah, v2, p763
2. Musnad Ahmad, v3, p138
3. Al-Musanaf, by abdulrazaq, v5, p466
4. Al-Sunnan al-kubra, by Bayhaqi, v9, p151
5. Sunnan Kubra, by Nisai, v5, p194
6. Musnad Abi Yala, v6, p194
7. Sahih ibn Habban, v10, p390
8. Mu'ajam Kabir, by Tabarani, v3, p220
9. Tarikh Dimashq, v12, p102

Can Mufti Sahib tell us that why Rasul Allah (s) didn't discourage him to adopt Taqiyyah in this case? Rather than discourage him, Rasul Allah (s) encouraged him by permitting to say whatever the Kuffar wanted him to say.

In the case of Hadhrat Ammar (ra), Mufti Sahib offered a lame excuse that he was weeping and Rasul (s) wanted to comfort his heart, and refrained from telling him the complete truth. We would be interested to know what excuse the Mufti of Nawasib or his pathetic followers have in this case?

72. Deeming something Halal in Sharia Haram

We have already mentioned that Taqiyyah is only permitted in extreme cases, when one fears for his life. Mufti needs to recognize that not only is Taqiyyah allowed in extreme cases when one 'fears for life', but can also (as we cited previously) be used to take back the wealth from tyrant Kings. [Please see the traditon of Hajaj Ibn Aalat above].

Imam Fakhruddin Razi states in the Tafseer of verse Qur'an, Volume 3 pages 28-29 likewise comments:

"Fifth Rule: Taqiyyah is allowed for the protection of life. The question is whether it is allowed for the protection of property; possibly that too may is permissible, because the Prophet (saw) has said: `The sanctity of a-Muslim's property is like the sanctity of his blood'; and he (s) also said: `Whoever is killed in defence of his property, is a martyr'. This is also because man depends immensely on his property; if water is sold at an exorbitant rate, wudhu' does not remain wajib and one may pray with tayammum to avoid that small loss of property; so why should this principle not be applied here? And Allah knows best".

Rather than follow his own conjectures, Mufti Sahib must follow the complete Sunnah of Rasul Allah (s). When we examine history, we find that Shi'a scholars were always busy defining the different conditions for practicing Taqiyyah according to the Sharia, while Nasibi scholars were busy concocting all manner of innovations pertaining to Taqiyyah and deeming the Halal of Islamic Sharia Haram, simply to get the opportunity to criticize the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as].

73. Uthman Ibn Affan vs. Mufti Sahib

The Mufti of Nawasib has tried to prove that he is true follower of Uthman Ibn Affan. He adopted the same style of conjecture (Qiyyas), that Uthman Ibn Affan used i.e. 'abandoning the regulations of Sharia in cases of hardships is a virtuous act'. If the 'permissibility theory' proposed by Mufti Khalid Mahmood al-Nasibi pertaining to Taqiyyah is indeed correct, then what would the Mufti and his Nasibi adherents say in case of the permissibility of Qasar prayers when one is on a journey? Does he also deem it preferable to offer the complete Prayer during a journey? We don't know what Mufti Sahib would answer, but allow us look at the same style of Qiyyas, that was adopted by Uthman Ibn Affan:

Narrated 'Abdur Rahman bin Yazid:
We offered a four Rakat prayer at Mina behind Ibn 'Affan . 'Abdullah bin Masud was informed about it. He said sadly, "Truly to Allah we belong and truly to Him we shall return." And added, "I prayed two Rakat with Allah's Apostle at Mina and similarly with Abu Bakr and with 'Umar (during their caliphates)." He further said, "May I be lucky enough to have two of the four Rakat accepted (by Allah)."
Sahih Bukhari, Volume 2, Book 20, Number 190

Mufti Sahib must know that conjecture in such cases fail and are Haram. Does he know the status of Prophethood? This status demands one to convey the message and remove any ambiguity since a matter shall become guidance to millions.

74. The 'permissibility theory' when one is starving to death

In Islam, one is allowed to eat Haram things if one is at risk of starving to death. Imam Jalaluddin Suyuti in his book, "al-Ashbah Wa al-Naza'ir," affirms that…

"it is acceptable (for a Muslim) to eat the meat of a dead animal at a time of great hunger (starvation to the extent that the stomach is devoid of all food); and to losen a bite of food (for fear of choking to death) by alcohol; and to utter words of unbelief; and if one is living in an environment where evil and corruption are the pervasive norm, and permissible things (Halal) are the exception and a rarity, then one can utilize whatever is available to fulfill his needs."

Can Mufti and his Nasibi adherents tell us, which person is the virtuous one:

1. A person who takes advantage of this permission, and eats Haram things in order to save his life.
2. A person that abandons this 'permission' and due to hunger and thirst starves to death.

According to the 'permissibility theory' proposed by Mufti Khalid Mahmood, the more virtuous act would be starving to death rather than eating/drinking Haram things! We don't think we need to comment any more here. Allah (swt) says in the Quran:

(Quran 5:87) O' those who believe, do not make unlawful the good things which Allah has made lawful for you, and do not transgress. Allah does not like transgressors.

It is indeed amazing that these Nawasib who claim to love and protect the memory of the Sahaba have the audacity to degrade the Iman of Ammar Yasir (ra) to a second level on the basis of their conjecture.

75. The migration issue raised by Mufti Khalid Mahmoood

On page 39 and 40, Mufti Khalid Mahmood presented the following verse of Quran:
Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 39
Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 40

[Yusufali 4:97] When angels take the souls of those who die in sin against their souls, they say: "In what (plight) Were ye?" They reply: "Weak and oppressed Were we in the earth." They say: "Was not the earth of Allah spacious enough for you to move yourselves away (From evil)?" Such men will find their abode in Hell,- What an evil refuge!

From this verse, Mufti Khalid Mahmood concluded that if someone dies in state of Taqiyyah, then his abode is Hell, their excuse that they were weak and oppressed on the earth will not benefit them, since Allah (swt) ordered them to migrate in such a case.

He then applies this verse to Maula Ali (as) and the other infallible ones (as) and questions why they adopted Taqiyyah and didn't migrate from Madina during the Caliphate of the first three caliphs, Bani Ummayah and Bani Abbas.

76. Our Reply

The deceitful author cited the verse out of context to mould his hypothesis, while neglecting all other Quranic verses and Ahadith that provide more details about the situations wherein Taqiyyah can be practiced.

The above verse was revealed for the hypocrites (Munafiqeen) and their excuses for co-operating with Kuffar (infidels) during wars i.e. they came along with Kuffar during the battle of Badr to fight the Muslims, when previously the order came from Allah (swt) to migrate from Makkah in order to strengthen the Muslims in Madina.

In any case, the Nawasib need to look at the verse more closely. It begins: **"Indeed, those whom the Angels take while they are oppressing their own souls."** This verse, from then on makes no reference to believers, since a believer is not oppressing himself through sin and corrupt behavior. The verse is exposing hypocrites that chose to live amongst the polytheists, and when asked at the time of death why they chose to live amongst polytheists instead of believers, they offer the lame excuse that they were oppressed 'when they were actually not' but rather oppressed themselves through disbelief and hypocrisy.

There are two points, that must not be ignored about the above verse if one wants to arrive at the correct conclusion.

1. This verse is not dealing with Muslims, who are living in an Islamic state, but with hypocrites who are living among polytheists.
2. This verse is not dealing with Taqiyyah, whilst according to Shi'a Fiqh, it is Haram to kill or cause any damage to any Muslim brother in the state of Taqiyyah.

According to Shi'a Fiqh, in such situations:

- One must either abandon Taqiyyah and refuse to follow the commands of tyrant Kings (and even be killed for this).
- Or he must migrate to another land.

Let's see what Ibn Kathir wrote in the commentary of above verse:

(Verily, as for those whom the angels take (in death) while they are wronging

themselves)." Ad-Dahhak stated that this Ayah was revealed about some hypocrites who did not join the Messenger of Allah but remained in Makkah and went out with the idolaters for the battle of Badr. They were killed among those who were killed. Thus, this honorable Ayah was revealed about those who resided among the idolaters [and supported them in killing Muslims during wars, instead of migrating to Madina].
Tafseer of Ibn Kathir

If the fact has become clear to our readers that this verse refers to a particular situation, in which one is forbidden to practice Taqiyyah, then we can move forward and see another verse of the Quran, that informs us of some believers, who didn't migrate and practiced Taqiyyah in Makka (but were not forced to kill other Muslims).

77. Verse of Quran about Momineen who lived under Taqiyyah in Makkah

During the treaty of Hudabiyyah, there were several Muslims who were living under Taqiyyah in Makkah and were unknown to others. This was a time when Muslims had sufficient power in Madinah and the Kufar were incapable of attacking Muslims. People wanted Rasul Allah (s) to attack Makka, but he refused to issue such a directive. Umar bin Khattab was so incensed that he protested to the Holy Prophet (saw), and in later days he said:

I did not entertain any doubt about the prophethood of the Holy Prophet since I accepted Islam except on that day of Hudaibiyah.
1. Musanaf Abdulrazaq, Volume 5 page 332
2. Sahih ibn Haban, Volume 11 page 224
3. Al-Mujam al-Kabir by Tabarani, Volume 20 page 14
4. Zaad al-Maad by Ibn Qayim, Volume 3 page 257

Replying to that group, Allah explains one of the reasons for that treaty and why war was avoided at that time:

[Pickthal 48:25] These it was who disbelieved and debarred you from the Inviolable Place of Worship, and debarred the offering from reaching its goal. <u>And if it had not been for believing men and believing women, whom ye know not - lest ye should tread them under foot and thus incur guilt for them unknowingly;</u> that Allah might bring into His mercy whom He will - If (the believers and the disbelievers) had been clearly separated We verily had punished those of them who disbelieved with painful punishment.

Our readers will see that Allah (swt) didn't consider those 'believing men and women' as evil-doers, nor promised dreadful punishment for them after their death, on the contrary, Allah (swt) said that if Muslims would do it, they would incur guilt for them unknowingly.

Therefore, this verse clearly shows that the innovation (Bidah) of Mufti Khalid Mahmood according to which 'Allah promised dreadful punishment for those who dies under Taqiyyah' is contrary to the Holy Quran. Mufti Sahib has taken the verse of 'evil doers' out of context.

78. According to Nasibi fiqh, one cannot fight or migrate when living under a tyrant Muslim ruler

It is very strange that Mufti Khalid Mahmood claimed such a thing *(i.e. it not allowed to do Taqiyyah whole of his life),* while according to Nasibi fiqh, one is **ORDERED** to adopt Taqiyyah before a Muslim ruler that establishes Salat for life, even if he prohibits you from offering Hajj, paying Zakat, is a drunkard or kills innocent people [like the drunkard Yazid did in Karbala and then in Madina during the incident of Hara]. One is not allowed to fight such a tyrant, but must

remain silent (like the great Sahaba of Nawasib did by not fighting against Yazid). Please bare in mind the difference between the **"permission"** for not raising swords and an **"order"** for not doing so. We read in Sahih Muslim, Book 020, Number 4570:

It has been narrated (through a different chain of transmitters) on the authority of Umm Salama (wife of the Holy Prophet) that he said: Amirs will be appointed over you, and you will find them doing good as well as bad deeds. One who hates their bad deeds is absolved from blame. One who disapproves of their bad deeds is (also) safe (so far as Divine wrath is concerned). But one who approves of their bad deeds and imitates them (is doomed). ***People asked: Messenger of Allah, shouldn't we fight against them? He replied: No, as long as they say their prayer.***

In light of this Sunni tradition we would like to ask Mufti Khalid Mahmood and his Nasibi adherents:

How can you criticize Maula Ali (as), when according to your own fiqh, one is 'ordered' not to raise the sword before a tyrant Muslim ruler? If you still want to criticize Maula Ali (as) for not raising sword against early Khulafa, then can you firstly prove that the early caliphs abandoned Salat (prayers)?

Were the Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] ever compelled to kill other Muslims?

As previously mentioned, there are some conditions that make it 'obligatory' to abandon Taqiyyah, for example if you are compelled to cause damage to innocent people and you are being compelled to do it out of fear of your own life. Maula Ali (as) and other Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] never faced such situation under the tyrant Caliphs of Bani Ummayah and Bani Abbas. It was therefore never 'obligatory' upon them to migrate for the same reason.

79. Taqiyyah of the Imams [as] vs. Migration

As we have mentioned, the Islamic concept of Taqiyyah means 'choosing the best option', that benefits Islam, and that is why Maula Ali (as) and the other Imams (as) were able to serve and benefit Islam in a much better way by staying amongst the Muslims, rather than migrating to non Muslim lands. The Imams couldn't migrate to the land of infidels and abandon the Muslims. Many of the Imams spent many years helping the Muslims and educating them. Despite the differences with the Sheikhain, Maula Ali (as) was always there whenever Islam was confronted with adverse times, that even forced Umar to testify:

"Had there been not Abul Hassan (Maula Ali), I would have been perished"

This fact has even been attested by Wahabi scholar Abu'l Hasan Nadwi who stated in his work, "The life of Caliph Ali", page 202:

"Umar was often exacerbated if Ali was not available to solve an entangled problem. He often used to say: 'Umar would have been ruined if Ali was not there"
Taken from Izalatul Khifa by Shah Waliyullah Volume 2 page 268 (on the authority of Abu Umar related from Saeed al Musayyib)

Similarly, the fifth and sixth Imams [as], established schools and had thousands of students. All of the Imams educated the Muslims. They had other duties to perform, they had to improve the ummah and revive it, and most importantly, the Imams [as] could not migrate while they had to lead their Shi'as. There was a whole 'wikalah system' for collecting Khums and then distributing it amongst the needy. Even those Imams (as), who were under the strict control of tyrant governments, successfully administered the system of guidance and khums through their

representatives. We cannot go into details here for what the Imams (as) did for Ummah as it would require several volumes, so please refer to books on their Biographies.

80. Yusuf (as) in the court of Kafir Firawn vs. Maula Ali (as) during the reign of the three Caliphs

Taqiyyah means diplomacy, and Prophet Yusuf (as) in the court of the Kafir Firawn, adopted the best option under those circumstances, in order to serve the interests of Islam. Nawasib also accept that Yusuf (as) chose that option that best served the Deen of Allah (swt). Curiously, when it comes to Maula Ali (as), the same Nawasib question why he didn't migrats and assert it was Haram for him to adopt the method of Yusuf (as)! Double standards and hypocrisy!

81. Some of the Imams [as] spent vast portions of their lives under house arrest and government control

Some of Nawasib criticize our Imams [as] who spent mush of their lives under house arrest and government control. They ask:

1. how did they benefit Islam
2. why didn't they migrate?

Even these Imams [as] ran the affairs through their representatives. They would answer their questions through letters and other methods. In this way the Shi'a Muhadditheen were able to collect many Ahadith from these Imams [as]. We mentioned earlier, that there are several Ahadith which show that:

- the people were able to send the right of "Prophet's near kin" (i.e. Khums) to the Imams [as] via these representatives.
- this Khums money was then cascaded by the Imams (as) to the poor and needy people were helped by the Imams [as]

All of the Imams [as] living under house arrest, were by definition weak and oppressed. They were subjected to such intense surveillance that it was impossible for them to migrate. Even Allah (swt) excused such people in the Quran from migrating. The following verse is the next verse of "evil doers" cited by Khalid Mahmoood in which Allah threatened those hypocrites, who had not migrated and fought against Muslims.

إِلاَّ الْمُسْتَضْعَفِينَ مِنَ الرِّجَالِ وَالنِّسَاء وَالْوِلْدَانِ لاَ يَسْتَطِيعُونَ حِيلَةً وَلاَ يَهْتَدُونَ سَبِيلاً

[Yusufali 4:98] Except those who are (really) weak and oppressed - men, women, and children - who have no means in their power, nor (a guide-post) to their way.

In Tafsir Ibn Kathir, it is written under the commentry of this verse that:

"Al-Bukhari recorded that Abu An-Nu`man said that Hammad bin Zayd said that Ayyub narrated that Ibn Abi Mulaykah said that Ibn `Abbas commented on the verse, (Except the weak ones among men), "I and my mother were among those (weak ones) whom Allah excused."

Tafseer of Ibn Kathir

82. Imams of Ahlulbayt [as] Vs. common Shi'as

As compared to the Imams of Ahlublayt [as], common Shi'as had the opportunity to move freely, thus the Imams of Ahlublayt [as] encouraged them to migrate, even to Kuffar lands where they could practice their religion freely. This was the reason for Islam's view on **at-**

ta'arrub ba'd al-hijra as reflected in many ahadith. **At-ta'arrub ba'd al-hijra** means leaving an environment where you could follow Islam and moving to a place where you maybe prone to not following Islam. Such a thing is counted as a major sin. Abu Basir says that he heard Imam as-Sadiq (a.s.) saying:

"The major sins are seven: killing a person intentionally; associating someone or something with the Almighty Allah (shirk); wrongfully accusing a married woman of adultery; Knowingly dealing in usury; running away from the battle-field in jihad; at-ta'arrub ba'd al-hijra; causing distress to one's parents [by encroaching on their rights]; and wrongfully acquiring the property of the orphan." Then he said, "At-ta'arrub and shirk are one and the same [in severity]."
Usool al-Kafi, Volume 2 page 281

We also read that:

Hammad al-Samandri narrates that he asked Imam as-Sadiq (a.s.), "I visit the cities of polytheism [i.e., of the polytheists]; and there are some among us who say that 'if you die over there, you will be raised [in the Hereafter] along with them.'" The Imam asked me, "O Hammad, when you are over there do you talk about our affair [i.e., our truth] and call [people] to it?" I replied, "Yes." The Imam asked me, "When you are in these cities, the cities of Islam, do you talk about our affair and call [people] to it?" I replied, "No." The Imam said, "If you die over there [in the land of the non-Muslims], you will be raised as an ummah by yourself, and there will be light in front of you!"
Wasa'il al Shia, Volume 15 page 101

83. The migration of Sadaat to different lands in order to get rid of tyrant rulers

We find the history related to the migration of Syeds, mostly in the texts of Wali Allah's (Saints) in books like Tadhkiratul Makhdoom Jahaniya, Tadhkiratul Awliya, Safeenatul Awliya and other like-topic books. Mainly, during the Abbasid reign, it was very difficult for the Syeds to live in Iran and other Arab world, where there were literal orders to shoot them on sight. The Imams [as] themselves were specially protected or exempt from the shoot on sight order, due to the political reasons of the kingdom. This can be very well explained from the incidents of the time of Imam Raza [as] and the king of the time.

The Sada'at, migrated to South Russian states and India at the time. The descendants of Imam al-Hadi al-Naqvi[as], migrated to Bokhara (now in Uzbekistan). Many descendants of Imam Raza [as], the Rizvis went to the border areas of Kashmir and India specifically to the city of Kareeri. The descendants of Imam Ja'afar [as], the Jafferis migrated to India, to the area which is now in Pakistan called Muhammadi Pur Madina, it is in the district of Gujrat. The descendants of Imam Zaynul Abedeen [as], the Zaidis also migrated to India originally to the areas of Lucknow and Hyderabad. Nearly all stayed at their new places, apart from Naqvis who were in Bukhara. After the great occultation of Imam Mahdi [as], the situation got worst for the Syeds in the Arab, Iranian and now Southern Russian states, which was under Iranian government.

All the Naqvi Sad'at fleeing the killings had to migrate to India, to the area now in Pakistan called Uch. It is on the border of Sindh and Punjab. But, from there many then migrated back to Bukhara, some went to Neshapur in Iran (near Mashad), and also Afghanistan.

This migration out of India was in the mission of Tableegh (preaching). The situation at the time was slightly better for them to travel back in to the Iranian estates.

7. Chapter Seven: Nasibi criticism leveled at Maula Ali [as] for adopting Taqiyyah

On page 40 (and on many other places), Mufti Khalid Mahmoood criticized Maula Ali (as) for not rising against the Sheikhain for his right of Caliphate and Fadak.
Taqiyyah Na Kijey, Page 40

Since Nawasib have been using this objection for centuries, allow us see if it was really in the interests of Islam if Maula Ali (as) would have started the war against Sheikhain at that stage.

84. Why Maula Ali (as) didn't raise his Dhulfiqar against Sheikhain?

This has been a very common Nasibi argument, and is tactically used by the followers of Mu'awiya to mock the Shi'a. We should point out to these people Nasibi that Imam 'Ali (as)'s decision not to take physical action was not due to his practicing Taqiyya (through fear of life) and neither was it because he loved the three khalifas. His decision was based on the following reasons as we have set out:

85. Reply One - It was Abu Bakr's duty to return what was not his, not Imam Ali to demand it

Simple example. A man has a son and bequeaths his property to him he does openly in the presence of witnesses, (that include his uncle). If when the father dies his uncle seizes the property and claims it as his, places guard to guard the property. In such circumstances the uncle is the usurper the son is the aggrieved party. In such circumstances it is incumbent on the Uncle to RETURN the property to his nephew, not on the nephew to use force to take it back. When the uncle is in the wrong the onus is on him to put things right not the son to fight for his right.

86. Reply Two - Imam 'Ali did not want to cause open division and bloodshed

These Nawasib need to look at the situation at THAT particular time when Abu Bakr seized power. Allah (swt) declared clearly that Madina and its surrounding locality was FULL of munafiq (Surah Munafiqoon). Rasul (s) has stated that the sign of a munafiq is hatred of Imam 'Ali. Hence Madina was full of Imam 'Ali 's opponents who were looking for the excuse to harm him. Abu Bakr had full control of the State machinery. He was in power / had the army at his disposal etc. Had he risen at that time he along with the Shi'a would have been wiped out, on the excuse that it was right to do so to quell sedition.

Don't forget we read in Tabari that Umar was prepared to set alight the house of Sayyida Fatima because men in her home had gathered in opposition to Abu Bakr. If Umar was so ruthless to not even care for the life of Sayyida Fatima[as] then he would have had no hesitation in killing her husband and her supporters.

At that time, Imam 'Ali had to think what was best for his followers; any opposition would have caused loss of life. Any action at that time would have caused major dissension and bloodshed, and Rasul (s) said:

"Your position to me is like the position of Aaron to Moses, except that there shall be no Prophet after me"
1. Sahih al-Bukhari, Arabic-English version, Traditions 5.56 and 5.700

2. Sahih Muslim, Arabic, section of virtues of Ali, v4, pp 1870-71
3. Sunan Ibn Majah, p12
4. Musnad Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, v1, p174
5. al-Khas'is, by al-Nisa'i, pp 15-16
6. Mushkil al-Athar, by al-Tahawi, v2, p309

The analogy that Prophet (PBUH) mentioned in the above tradition, became a reality after his demise. Most of companions (except few) became disloyal to Ali (as) after the death of Prophet (PBUH), turned against him, and preferred some other people to him. The majority of people disobeyed Ali (as), as their forefathers disobeyed Haroon (AS). They did not take lessons from the Quran and the history, and thus history repeated itself. The repetition of the history of the Children of Israel for Muslims was confirmed by Prophet (s).

Narrated Abu Sa'id al-Khudri:
The Prophet said, "You will follow the ways of those nations who were before you, span by span and cubit by cubit (i.e., inch by inch) so much so that even if they entered a hole of a mastigure (lizard), you would follow them." We said, "O Allah's Apostle! (Do you mean) the Jews and the Christians?" He said, "Whom else?"
Sahih al-Bukhari Hadith: 9.422

Think for a while... Why would the Prophet (a) compare his companions to the Jews and the Christians, knowing full well that the Jews and the Christians have mutilated and perverted the religion of Allah (swt)?

Because Allah (swt) had told him (s) that your companions will turn back, except the select few.

Now if we analyse the Quran; we read that Prophet Musa (as) became extremely upset when he heard that Bani Israel started worshipping the idol of a calf. He came back from Miqaat and grabbed Haroon (as) by his beard. Harun (as) replied in a distressed state:

(20:94) "O son of my mother, do not seize me by my beard or my head. Truly, I feared but you should say that I caused a division among the Bani-Isra'il and did not respect my word"

In the same way that Harun did not intervene at that particular time fearing further fragmentation amongst the Ummah, Imam Ali (as) also did not act as he did not want the Ummah to be at each others throats since the only beneficiaries would be the munafiqs who would exploit the situation and destroy Islam through internal deception.

87. Reply Three -The wider situation meant it would have been disastrous to act

On a wider scale look at the situation at the time. We had munafiqs in Madina, and worse the threat of attack from the neighbouring Christian Byzantine Empire. This was a very real danger since in 10 Hijri, Rasul (s) led the expedition of Tabuk to counter the Byzantine threat. On top of that in the Arabian Peninsula, Musalimah had risen up and declared himself a Prophet (s) and was making preparations to attack Madina. Had Imam Ali at this stage rose up, the Ummah would have been totally fragmented, Muslims would have been fighting each other and Musalimah the liar. What better time would there have been for the Byzantines to attack than when the Muslims were divided, fighting each other AND fighting Musalimah? At that time the Ummah would have been so weak on account of internal upheaval there would have been a real risk of the Byzantines invading and destroying the Muslim Ummah. In such circumstances Imam Ali had the interests of the Deen as priority, he did not want to trigger any event that might inflict harm to the Deen and its adherents. If anything this shows the greatness of the Imam that he was willing to sacrifice his right, if it meant a guarantee that the Deen and its adherents were protected from harm.

88. Reply Four - Imam Ali was following the Sunnah of Rasul (s), desisting from actions that might be exploited by non Muslims

We read in Sahih al Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 428: Narrated Jabir bin 'Abdullah:

We were in a Ghazwa (Sufyan once said, in an army) and a man from the emigrants kicked an Ansari man (on the buttocks with his foot). The Ansari man said, "O the Ansar! (Help!)" and the emigrant said. "O the emigrants! (Help!) Allah's Apostle heard that and said, "What is this call for, which is characteristic of the period of ignorance?" They said, "O Allah's Apostle! A man from the emigrants kicked one of the Ansar (on the buttocks with his foot)." Allah's Apostle said, "Leave it (that call) as is a detestable thing." 'Abdullah bin Ubai heard that and said, 'Have the (the emigrants) done so? By Allah, if we return Medina, surely, the more honorable will expel therefrom the meaner." When this statement reached the Prophet. 'Umar got up an, said, "O Allah's Apostle! Let me chop off the head of this hypocrite ('Abdullah bin Ubai)!" The Prophet said "Leave him, lest the people say that Muhammad kills his companions." The Ansar were then more in number than the emigrants when the latter came to Medina, but later on the emigrant increased.

The reference makes it clear that a hypocrite was sitting in the midst of the Sahaba, Umar offered to have him killed, but Rasul (s) said "Leave him, lest the people say that Muhammad kills his companions; i.e. he (s) did not want his actions to be exploited / incorrectly interpreted by non Muslims. In the same way that Rasul (s) had spared the life of a hypocrite fearing that outside elements would exploit the situation, Imam Ali acted on the Sunnah of Rasul (s) refraining from lifting his sword as he was aware that outside elements would have picked up on this and painted a damaging image of Islam.

The true Imam thinks about consequences of actions both present and future. Imam Ali did not want to act in a manner that would be exploited by future non Muslim generations in a manner that would be detrimental to the Deen. Had Imam Ali raised his sword at that time then no doubt anti Muslim elements of that time and present would have exploited the situation to the max they would have said **'Look, this is Islam, its all about power here we have the closest companions fighting not for religion but the throne of Muhammad (s)'**

This portrayal would have created a very bad image of Islam, non-Muslims would have picked up on this and exploited it, and it would have repelled people away from Islam. If Rasul (s) refrained from lifting the sword against a munafiq fearing the perception of outsiders, then Imam Ali was fully within his rights when he refrained from raising his sword against Abu Bakr, to do so was the Sunnah of Rasul (s).

89. Azam Tariq’s objection on Imam Ali [as]: ‘Why didn’t Ali [as] restore the actual teachings of Islam during his caliphate?’

Similarly, Azam Tariq al-Nasibi also took an opportunity to criticize Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as] for not being able to change the practices of the previous caliphs that according to Shias were unIslamic. The Nasibi author asks, why Ali bin Abi Talib [as] accepted the caliphate, the objectives of which were not achievable by him?

90. Reply

Whilst the previous discussions shall suffice to answer this objection since the author has attacked us from a slightly different angle, we shall provide with further clarity, since the objection raised by the Nasibi author, often also disturbs the naïve Sunni.

We should ask the adherents of the Nasibi author to put the matter of caliphate aside and tell

us 'what are the objectives and responsibilities of Prophethood (Nabuwat)?' No Nasibi can deny the fact that Harun [as] was a Prophet, yet he [as] witnessed his people committing the major sin of idol worship but adopted silence due to a fear of his own life as well as a fear of causing differences in his nation. Harun [as] was a prophet and the caliph of Musa [as] who remained silent watching this for forty days in the absence of Musa [as]. The absurd interpretation of the Nasibi cult, would suggest that Harun [as] should have thrown away prophethood or caliphate! If Nawasib do not support this conjecture, then why do they object to Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as] not trying to revive the actual teachings of Islam, that had been polluted by the previous caliphs? We know that the sole reason of their criticism is the Naisibism running through their veins.

In order to make the stance of Imam Ali [as] clear to the dim witted Nasibis, let us seek reliance on a tradition recorded by Imam Dhahabi:

When the government of Bani Abbas came, they started prayers before the sermon, thus people returned by saying: 'the Sunnah has been changed, the Sunnah has been changed on the day of Eid'.
Siyar Alam an Nubla, Volume 9 page 56

Although the Bidah of having a sermon before the prayers was introduced by the rulers of Bani Ummayah, since the Bidah was implemented for many years, the people deemed it to be the correct form of Salat based on Islamic principles, and were not prepared to accept anything against that (Bidah). An attempt to change that Bidah introduced by the Bani Ummayah caused uproar among the Muslims and that too with the slogan '**Sunnah has been changed'.** This was only one example whilst there are many in the annals of history. For example we read that:

Abu Abdullah [as] said: 'When the commander of believers (as) arrived in Kufa, he ordered Hassan bin Ali [as] to announce to the people that there is no prayer in congregation in the mosques during the month of Ramadan, hence Hassan bin Ali [as] announced that to the people as the commander of believers ordered him. When the people heard the announcment of Hassan bin Ali, they started shouting and saying: 'O Umar, O Umar.' When Hassan bin Ali returned to the commander of believers, he (Ali) asked: 'What are these voices?' He (Hassan) replied: 'Oh commander of believers, the people are shouting 'O Umar, O Umar.' The commander of believers said: 'Tell them to pray'.
Tahdeeb al-Ahkam, Volume 3 page 70

During His [as] caliphate, whenever Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as] sought to revive the actual Sunnah by showing opposition to the decisions of previous caliphs, the majority of the people who had been the adherents of previous caliphs started to object and abandon Imam Ali [as]. A similar kind of situation took place during the issue of allowing or disallowing the sale of Umahat al Aolad. Ibn Taymiyah records:

"**It is proven through a Sahih chain that Ali stated: 'About not selling the Umahat al-Aolad , me and Umar had similar views but now I am of the view that Umahat al-Aolad can be sold'. His arbitrator Obaid Salmani told him: 'Your view, accompanied by Umar's view is more liked by us than your separate view only"**
Minhaj al-Sunnah, Volume 6 page 234

That is the reason that Imam of Nawasib Ibn Taymiyah has stated:

"**Although Ali [ra] achieved caliphate he did not achieve the authority that had been achieved by the previous caliphs"**
Minhaj al-Sunnah, Volume 3 page 249

Similarly, Shahwaliullah Dehalvi recorded:

"**All such meanings concerning him (Ali), may Allah be pleased with him, did not create any inadequacies in his character because he strived effortlessly in establishing Deen, although this opportunity was not provided to him. However, his having embodied divine qualities as a distinguisher (between evil and good) is another issue altogether. And if this was indeed the case, his governance of principles concerning the specific caliphate would not have been any different."**
Izalatul Khifa, Volume 1 page 334 (Sohail Acedemy, Lahore)

These texts prove that Ali bin Abi Talib [as] made efforts to revive the original Sunnah during his rein. But in this endeavor, the people that posed hurdle were the ones who by that time had been used to of the practices introduced by the previous caliphs and deemed those innovations as the correct form of Islam. Had Imam Ali [as] used force to implement the actual practices amongst the people whose majority were the adherents of the previous caliphs, they would have mobilised against him [as] and this would have caused bloodshed on a massive scale, with hypocrites led by Muawiyah waiting to exploit such problems. Alhamdolillah, Imam Ali bin Abi Talib [as] with his wisdom deemed it his priority to first resolve external problems, and then focus on internal matters. It is indeed unfortunate, that the hypocrites didn't give him that opportunity to resolve internal matters, and he [as] was martyred. Thus, external factors do matter in making attempts to promulgate even permissible things. We should hence remind our readers the following words recorded by Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti in Al Itqan (Urdu), Volume 2, page 67:

"**About the statement of Umar i.e "If I were not afraid of the fact that people may say that 'Umar has added to the Qur'an extra verses, I would have written the Verse al-Rajm with my own hands" Abu Bakar Razi has written in his book 'Al Burhan': 'The literal words of this statement prove that it is permissible [Jaiz] to write down those words in the Quran, and it was the fear of people which stopped Umar from this writing this in the Mushaf <u>and sometimes it happens that obstacles appear between permissible things</u> and since the writing the verse of stoning was permissible hence it is obvious that its recitation is also proven."**

8. Chapter Eight: Conclusion

We have seen that Taqiyyah is part and parcel of the Islamic religion. Allah (swt) desires that His Servants come to him and worship Him (swt), but at the same time does not impose duress upon His Creation. We have seen from our analysis that the Holy Qu'ran and the Sunnah of the Prophet (s) acknowledges this reality, making Taqiyyah a part of the religion of Islam.

Even if we put these arguments aside, logic itself dictates the permissibility of Taqiyyah, for its usage is the logical outcome in believing in a Kind and Merciful God. The Wahabi enemies of the Ahl'ulbayt (as), however, do not believe in such a God. Theirs is a God who is waiting for any chance to cast His servants into hell-fire, and will cast his adherent into Hell on account of the shortness of his beard, the length of his trousers or his failure to wear a kaftan. We call upon our readers to recognize that Allah (swt) has opened the doors of Mercy to the believers, and does not seek to cause them hardship and distress except when it is needed to enable justice.

Imam Baqir [as] once stated:

"**Taqiyyah is to be done at every time of neccessity, and this neccesstiy is only known by the one confronts with it"**
Wasail Shia, Volume 11 page 468

9. Copyright

All rights, including copyright, in the content of these Answering-Ansar.org web pages are owned or controlled for these purposes by the Answering-Ansar.org team.

You can distribute the download version of "Adobe® PDF" documents of the Answering-Ansar.org articles, as long as the documents remain in their original state and none of the contents are modified in any format.

The Answering-Ansar.org reserves the right over the contents of the articles if they are used in the original format. You can freely distribute the Islamic references and quotes that we use in our articles in any format.

When using our articles in your websites or if in distribution in print format, please include the source as Answering-Ansar.org.

Our web site contains links to third party sites. These links are used for the convenience of our users; however, they are not under the control of Answering-Ansar.org. We are not responsible for their contents, nor should they be considered endorsements of the individual linked sites.

However, it is possible that the site could contain typographical errors. If such a condition is brought to our attention, a reasonable effort will be made to fix or remove it.

If you wish to reproduce, print and distribute our articles in book format, then you will need a written permission of Answering-Ansar.org. If you wish to do so, then please contact us for further details.